

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08044481 7

ID
Dunn

How Presidents Are Made

ARTHUR WALLACE DUNN


Washington Correspondent; Author of "Gridiron Nights"
and "Political and Personal Reminiscences of
Thirty Years."



FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY

NEW YORK AND LONDON

1920



COPYRIGHT, 1920, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
[Printed in the United States of America]
Published in April, 1920

Copyright Under the Articles of the Copyright Convention
of the Pan-American Republics and the
United States, August 11, 1910.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Preface	5
I. Caste and Political Parties.....	7
II. Federalism and States' Rights —Adams and Jefferson.....	13
III. The Virginia Succession—Madi- son and Monroe.....	17
IV. Developing Issues—Slavery and the Tariff.....	19
V. Passing of Congressional Caucus —Adams	22
VI. Personal Popularity a Factor— Jackson, Van Buren, Harrison.	24
VII. Slavery and the Northern Boun- dary as Factors—Polk.....	27
VIII. The Mexican War—Taylor.....	30
IX. Slavery Issue Looming.....	33
X. Slavery Compromise—Pierce....	35
XI. Anti-Slavery Republicans De- feated—Buchanan	38
XII. Extension vs. Restriction of Slav- ery—Lincoln	41
XIII. The Soldier Vote and War Issues —Lincoln and Grant.....	45
XIV. Liberal Republican Movement— Grant vs. Greeley.....	48

CHAPTER	PAGE
XV. The Electoral Commission— Hayes vs. Tilden.....	51
XVI. Third Term Issue—Garfield.....	55
XVII. Mugwump Independency— Cleveland	57
XVIII. Protectionist Tariff—Harrison..	61
XIX. The Tariff and Free Silver— Cleveland	68
XX. Gold Standard vs. Free Silver— McKinley	75
XXI. "Imperialism," Silver, the Tariff —McKinley	81
XXII. Personal Popularity—Roosevelt..	84
XXIII. Tariff and Personal Influence— Taft	87
XXIV. Republican Disharmony—Wilson	91
XXV. Anti-War Sentiment and Tactical Mistakes—Wilson	97
XXVI. The Negro as a Political Factor.	104
XXVII. Prohibition, Suffrage, Socialism..	108

PREFACE

POLITICS reaches an all-absorbing interest in the United States in the election of presidents. The Constitution of the United States made the president a powerful personage, equal to and in many cases far more potent than hereditary sovereigns. The tendency as the years pass has been toward centralization and a consequent increase of presidential power. The importance of the presidency has increased accordingly, and each recurring quadrennial election is a critical political event.

There is a general impression that presidents are elected upon "issues"; that is, questions of national policy that arise from time to time, supposedly every four years. This is a mistake, as few presidents have been chosen on issues, and few issues have been settled by presidential elections. Personality and opportunity have had much to do with the result, and it is interesting to note how often accident or incident has played an important part in president-making.

Parties are the natural outgrowth of politics. For the most part men have voted for their party candidate regardless of issues, often when they knew that the party candidate was not the best man and that the party platform was wrong on the main issues. Party allegiance in a large majority of cases overtops patriotic judgment.

This review of the politics which made presi-

dents is not designed as a history of politics or of presidents, but rather to present in a compact form the reason why certain men were chosen to the presidency of the United States.

Naturally more space is given to the last third of a century, because the questions of that period are issues to-day and may be for some time to come. Most, if not all, of the questions upon which presidents were elected and which agitated the country during the first hundred years of the nation ceased to be living issues soon after the Civil War.

A new era in politics began with the second century of the republic. The unrest which developed about that time, together with wars and domestic problems, have had an important influence upon the politics of the past thirty years and will no doubt have a far-reaching effect upon the politics of the future. For that reason a more extensive review is offered of the politics of that period.

To judge the future by the past is possible in politics only when conditions are similar. With the country entering upon an era of changed conditions, what will happen in the future is wholly in the realm of speculation; but what has happened in the past and its possible effect upon the future is always interesting, particularly as it relates to the influences that have shaped politics and elected presidents.

HOW PRESIDENTS ARE MADE

I

CASTE AND POLITICAL PARTIES

THERE were no political parties in America at the time of the Revolution. But there was caste, and the differences of caste created the political parties that battled for the control of the United States for many years following the administration of George Washington. The first president is the only man who has held that position who was neither a party man nor a partizan. His long service, his lofty conception of public duty, and his devotion to the country and its welfare were so honest, so sincere, so unselfish, that it raised him above the plane of party politics, a position that was never reached by any of his successors. But political parties were in process of formation during his administration. The caste which existed in the colonial days developed into political divisions. The differences in caste created divisions in the constitutional convention over which Washington presided and before he became president of the United States. There were two distinct elements, one wanting all power placed in a strong central government and the other wanting power left with the people, with the States. Some of what are called the "compromises of the constitution" were the adjustments of these differences.

On one side were the aristocracy, the property holding class, the churches, the better educated, the business heads, the makers of money; on the other side were agriculturists, land holders, pioneers, intellectual dreamers, the rough and rugged, the personally independent, the free-and-easy, those who hated restraint, those who feared domination of monarchy and the Church.

Attempts have been made to trace party differences in this country to those which existed in England at the time of the Revolution, but it is difficult to establish any such connection. The colonists had no part in the politics of England; they never were inoculated with the serum of either of the political parties there. It is probable that only a few Americans understood the party divisions existing in England and even they might have been at a loss to explain the difference between Whig and Tory. But the difference in caste was inherited from the mother country, as well as many ideas in regard to the forms of government. Divergent views were manifest in the constitutional convention, and afterward developed in the cabinet of the first president.

It is an interesting fact in connection with the development of political parties that differences were to a large extent fostered by happenings in Europe and by the disagreement between England and France at the time of and after the French Revolution. Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, favored Revolutionary France, even to the extent of her impossible demands, while Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, was pro-English, even to the extent of

being called a monarchist. Jefferson became the founder and leader of the Republican (afterward the Democratic) party, and Hamilton was the head if not the founder of the Federalist party. Hamilton was the advocate of a strong, centralized government, while Jefferson was the champion of democracy and the rights of the States. And for years they contended in Washington's cabinet for their particular views, driving the president nearly to distraction and at the same time laying the foundations of the party organizations which long battled for control of the government.

The most potent foreign influence in the politics of the United States was the hostilities between Great Britain and France. It was natural that the people of the United States at that time should take sides in Old World controversies; the American colonies, so long as they were wholly English, had to help fight the English battles against the French who were in possession of Canada and Louisiana. Later, when the strongest element in America became arrayed against Great Britain, the Revolution engendered a prejudice against England that has endured down to our own time, while a friendliness toward France existed because Frenchmen had come to the aid of the colonies and helped to make the revolt against Britain successful. In the years following, when the hostilities between Great Britain and France continued, and Britain was fighting the French Revolution or those in control of it, the sympathies of a large portion of Americans were with the revolutionists, for they had been revolutionists themselves and revo-

lution in their minds meant independence. Their sympathies were with the revolutionists even after the real purpose of the French Revolution had been accomplished and it had fallen into the hands of the Lenines and Trotskys of that day, who had nothing to offer the world but blood and destruction.

While there had been a decided prejudice against Great Britain on account of her oppression of the people of the colonies and because of the crimes and outrages perpetrated during the Revolutionary War, there was in the minds of many people a respect for those sterling English qualities which have made the nation famous. The desire for orderly liberty was the chief of these qualities in the English race, and that desire America had inherited and demonstrated by the Revolution. And so it happened that there became established in our politics during the first presidential administration two separate and distinct lines of thought, one English and the other French, which produced a divergence that helped to create two political parties. Even tho England was a severe and blundering overlord, there was in the English race, in English literature, in English civilization and love of liberty, much for Americans to admire and copy. And it was a natural sequence that a thoughtful and liberty loving people should recognize in the English system and method the way to liberty and enlightenment.

At the same time it was natural that the spirit which, with the aid of France, had achieved American independence should sympathize with and give aid to the independent movement that

was in control in France. But American sympathizers with France did not stop to analyze the situation. They forgot that it was French royalty, French nobility, and money of the French nobility that aided the American Revolution; that this was not the France which had come to the rescue of the United States; that, rather, it was the very caste in France that had lent assistance which was being sacrificed by the Revolution. Consequently sympathy with the French revolutionists found lodgment in the minds of many Americans and became one of the factors in the formation of a political party.

Thus there developed the divergent lines of political thought created by events which established a dominating English-speaking race on this continent and fostered by the events which soon after distracted Europe.

The influence which foreign controversies exerted in politics and the government in the early days of the republic was responsible for two of the most important declarations that have ever been made by presidents in regard to our foreign policy. One was the warning of Washington against entangling alliances with foreign countries, the other was the Monroe doctrine. During the greater portion of his administration Washington was involved in controversies originating in Europe with which the United States had no real concern. Nevertheless they were injected into our politics and at one time it appeared that they might determine a presidential election. Questions of similar character confronted Jefferson when he became president, and no doubt convinced him of the wisdom of Wash-

ington's policy against becoming involved in the wars, intrigue, and politics of Europe; he not only endorsed that policy, but was the first to outline distinctly what became the Monroe doctrine.

As time went on the parties created by Hamilton and Jefferson changed in character and policy. The Democratic party of to-day still retains some of the ideas of Jefferson and the Republican party some of the ideas of Hamilton, but both parties have changed as conditions changed. A long lease of power makes any party Federalistic and States' Rights is often the slogan of the party out of power.

II

FEDERALISM AND STATES' RIGHTS—ADAMS AND JEFFERSON

THE two great political parties of stability in the United States were created and became powerful because each favored a great principle. The Democratic party was founded on belief in the rights of the many as against the power and supremacy of the few. The Republican party was founded upon belief in human liberty and a cohesive federal nation. For the most part, however, presidents have been chosen for political or personal reasons not of high consequence to the country. Nor have party platforms and declarations been very effective in determining presidential elections. It should be remembered also that the large majority of the voters are aligned with their respective parties through inheritance or business considerations and that the independent voters really choose the president, especially in close elections. It often happens that the conditions which affect these independents decide the great political contests. Such conditions are often personal, sometimes political, rarely fundamental.

The first contest between political parties in this country occurred at the third presidential election. Washington had been twice elected unanimously and had declined a third term in an address which is a document of policy second only to the Declaration of Independence. The

contest was between John Adams of Massachusetts and Thomas Jefferson of Virginia. It was also a contest between the Federalists and Republicans. Adams' victory was due in part to the influence of Hamilton, but still more was owing to the personality of Washington. Jefferson had fought Hamilton throughout the administration of Washington and finally resigned as Secretary of State because the president decided in favor of Hamilton in some of the disputes. As author of the immortal Declaration and because of the prominence he attained as Minister to France during the French Revolution, Jefferson had a strong hold upon the affections of the people. But even his personal popularity could not overcome the power wielded by Washington, altho the unthinking at that time did not realize the wonderful services Washington had rendered his country.

The election of Adams was the only presidential success achieved by the Federal party. This first presidential contest occurred in 1796. There was a semblance of sectionalism in the election. The Southern States with the exception of Maryland voted for Jefferson, a Southern man, while the Northern States voted for Adams, a Northerner. Jefferson was better known in the South than he was in the North. He was more closely aligned with the planters of the South, and Adams was in closer touch with the business interests then developing in the North.

The Federal party began to disintegrate during the administration of Adams. Hamilton and the president disagreed on several important matters. Washington's influence could not heal

the differences. One of the most notable facts in political history is that when there is a split in a political party the factions become so bitterly hostile to each other, so vindictive, so controlled by personal animosities, that they prefer the success of the common enemy rather than that the rival faction should win. When the factions are nearly even in strength, or the bolting faction is of considerable size, it results in the defeat of the majority party and the success of the minority party.

The factional differences in the Federal party made it impossible for Adams to succeed himself. Added to the personalities that figured to such a large extent was the enactment of the sedition laws. These ill-timed measures hastened the downfall of the Federalists and strengthened Jefferson and the party which he was building.

Few realize that the great founder of the Democratic party came very near never being president. Even tho he had popularity as an advocate of the rights of the States and of the people, he was distrusted by a large element, a distrust which in 1800 manifested itself in the division of the electoral vote between Jefferson, Aaron Burr, and Adams and so threw the choice into the House of Representatives. There the vote was by States, each State having one vote cast by its delegation. The contest was long continued and many ballots were taken before Jefferson secured a majority of all the States. Even then he was indebted to Hamilton, who threw him Federal strength, preferring an honest opponent such as Jefferson to a charlatan like Burr.

In the first four presidential elections under the terms of the Constitution each elector voted for two candidates for president, the man having the highest number was chosen president and the man having the next highest was chosen vice-president. After 1800 the Constitution was changed and each elector cast one vote for president and one for vice-president. In 1800 Jefferson and Burr each had 73 electoral votes. Adams, candidate for re-election, had 65 votes.

Once in the presidential chair Jefferson ruled with that imperious will which is often characteristic of men who are champions of the rights of the people. Altho a "strict constructionist" (as the term was in those days) in regard to the Constitution, he overrode all constitutional objections and purchased Louisiana. The unpopular Embargo Act, stopping trade with Great Britain, was passed during Jefferson's administration, and altho New England threatened separation on account of it, Jefferson's popularity remained undiminished. In 1804 he was re-elected by a vote of 162 to 14 for his Federal opponent. He could have been elected for a third time in 1808, but he followed the wise custom established by Washington and declined. It was Jefferson who discontinued the custom of addressing Congress in person, a custom which was not revived until more than a century later.

III

THE VIRGINIA SUCCESSION—MADISON AND MONROE

AFTER Jefferson and for the next 16 years there followed what might be called the "Virginia succession," tho sometimes known as the "Secretary succession." This latter term was used because James Madison was Secretary of State under Jefferson and James Monroe was Secretary of State under Madison, both of Virginia. Jefferson was the controlling influence which made both Madison and Monroe presidents.

James Madison, during the formative stages of the republic, had gained a reputation entitling him to the grand prize—the presidency. And yet he was a Jefferson-made president. There was little in the political conditions of the times to make presidents. Madison naturally inclined to the Jefferson ideas, and it was quite natural that, holding the most important cabinet position for eight years under Jefferson, he should be the choice of Jefferson as his successor. It is true that Madison was nominated by a caucus of the Republican (Democratic) members of Congress, a system in vogue in those days for nominating presidential candidates; but Jefferson dominated Congress as no other president could until 1913. And it was by this control of Congress that Jefferson was able to name his successor, who in turn, by the same methods and the Jeffersonian influence, was able to name his suc-

cessor. The "Virginia succession," or the "Secretary succession" was broken when there was no longer an available candidate with a record in the Revolution or a man of such standing before the country as to win the approbation of the nation.

Meanwhile the Federal party was dying. It opposed the war of 1812, and a fact of politics is that an anti-war party is not successful in politics. Probably there never was such a badly managed war as that with England in 1812-14, but even with all the drawbacks and shortcomings it proved successful for the Republican (Democratic) party. Weak as was the conduct of the war, only three States voted against Monroe—the candidate of the then dominant party selected by the Congressional caucus as Madison's successor in 1816.

Our histories tell us about the "era of good feeling" and that the whole country was running along smoothly. As a matter of fact a condition prevailed that was very nearly a superior and benevolent despotism; practically that was what existed. Thomas Jefferson was the benevolent despot and had picked his successors for sixteen full years. That both of these two-term presidents were good men can not be denied. To Monroe we owe the great American declaration, the Monroe doctrine, altho its germination was found in Washington's "Farewell Address" and was fostered by the wise councils and admonitions of Jefferson.

IV

DEVELOPING ISSUES—SLAVERY AND THE TARIFF

IT was during Monroe's administration that the first rift occurred in the Republican (Democratic) party. Virginia had no one worthy to be successor of Monroe, and Jefferson had indicated as his choice William H. Crawford of Georgia. But a new political star had appeared among the political constellations—two in fact—and both came out of the West. Kentucky and Tennessee furnished the men who for more than two decades were to dominate the politics of America. They were Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson. The first was the greatest man of his time, but never president. The second was a brilliant, dominating personality with a war record. The latter not only became president for eight years but named his successor.

There appeared in the politics of that time a number of questions which were to become vastly important in later years, tho their importance was not then apparent. Henry Clay, wise man that he was, advocated an increase of the army and navy so as to make the United States impregnable against foreign aggression, and (also of vast importance) a protective tariff which would build up American industries and make the United States independent of the world. A minor question was that of internal improvements, the building of highways, construction of canals and utilization in other ways of the nat-

ural resources and advantages of the country for the upbuilding and advancement of the nation. Henry Clay favored national support of all these. He was opposed by those who were called "strict constructionists." The term "reactionary," was not in vogue in those days. Politics for nearly a hundred years have been fought along the lines of what may be called strictly economic questions, and these had more influence in determining political results than the really great questions which developed from time to time.

It was during the administration of Monroe, right in the midst of what historians call the "era of good feeling," that there developed the greatest of all questions in the politics and in the history of the United States. It was slavery. Slavery was the most vital question in America for more than forty years. It was "settled" more times than any other question and yet it continued to come to the surface and create political disturbances. It was intricately mixed up with the settlement and development of the West and the growth of the country. In the Southern States it was considered of such vital importance that everything else was sacrificed to its protection and advancement. As time went on it became so intertwined in the politics of the whole country that it finally resulted in the Civil War.

Slavery became a live issue about 1820, and yet it was not until 1860—forty years later—that a president of the United States was elected on that all-absorbing and tremendous problem in American politics. It was in 1820 that the

Missouri Compromise was adopted, an adjustment of slavery and anti-slavery differences brought about by Henry Clay. The Missouri Compromise took its name from the bill admitting Missouri as a State and prohibited slavery in all territory acquired by the purchase of Louisiana north of 36 degrees and 30 minutes, north latitude. Many people believed that the slavery question was settled by the Missouri Compromise, but the abolitionists of the North and the pro-slavery advocates of the South kept it alive as a political issue. It is an interesting fact in the political history of the United States that altho slavery was the all-absorbing topic of discussion, the subject of notable speeches and acrimonious debate in Congress for more than two-score years, no president was elected and no presidential candidate was defeated on that issue. During all that time the abolitionists were using their utmost endeavor to destroy the institution and anti-slavery men of a less aggressive type were trying to limit slavery to the region where it then prevailed, while at the same time the pro-slavery element was doing all in its power to expand slave territory and gain an ascendancy in the government. The great struggle was for territory. Slavery gained much by the annexation of Texas, which forced the war with Mexico. The anti-slavery side lost much in the failure to enforce our claim to the Northwest Territory lying between the 49th parallel and latitude 54 degrees and 40 minutes, north. While all the great events of the period were revolving around this question, no presidential election was fought on that issue until 1860.

V

PASSING OF CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS—ADAMS

THE presidential election in 1824 marked the breaking up of a system which had been in vogue from the time of Jefferson's administration. This was the nomination of candidates by a caucus of the Republican (Democratic) congressmen. They met in Washington and named the candidates, and the electors for 20 years ratified the caucus action. In 1824 new and independent elements entered the political arena. Andrew Jackson, the hero of the New Orleans battle against the British and a warrior who had fought in Florida, came to the fore and denounced "King Caucus" and the "Virginia" or "Secretary" succession. William H. Crawford of Georgia, Secretary of Treasury under Monroe and the Jefferson selection, was the choice of the caucus and the powers in control. Jackson became an independent Democratic candidate. John Quincy Adams was the candidate of a faction of the Republican party and the remnant of the Federal party. He was Secretary of State under Monroe, and under the system which had been in vogue from the time of Jefferson, was the natural successor to Monroe. But he was a Northern man and at that time there was a well-defined sectional feeling against a Northern man for president. Henry Clay of Kentucky, who was then a member of the Republican (Democratic) party, was also a candidate. Thus

there was a contest between three men from the South and one from the North, all nominally members of the same party, with the result that there was no choice in the electoral college and for a second time the election was thrown into the House of Representatives. Through the influence of Clay, who was fourth on the list in the electoral college and therefore ineligible, Adams was chosen president, altho Jackson had the largest popular vote and the highest vote in the electoral college. Clay became Secretary of State under Adams, and he never quite recovered from the charge of bargain and sale which was brought against him in all the after years of his political career.

Clay and Adams created a National Republican party which was the real foundation of the Whig party, and the party which for years had been called Republican became the Democratic party.

VI

PERSONAL POPULARITY A FACTOR—JACKSON, VAN
BUREN, HARRISON

ANDREW Jackson was elected president in 1828, mainly on his personality and almost without regard to the issues before the people. At that time there was a tariff issue, but Jackson, Democrat tho he was, was far from being in accord on the tariff question with John C. Calhoun, who was elected vice-president with him. In fact, it was the differences between them on this subject that caused the South Carolina nullification movement in which Jackson was personally successful; the final result was a modification of the protective tariff.

During this period politics became more personal than ever before. Issues were of little moment, altho in those days occurred the Jackson fight against the United States Bank, which would have been a stupendous political issue in any other period. Andrew Jackson was simply obsessed with carrying out his own ideas and pushing to the front his individual favorites. Like Jefferson, he had arranged the presidential succession for sixteen years, after his second term. He chose Martin Van Buren for eight years and Thomas H. Benton for eight years, Benton to follow Van Buren.

Jackson served his stormy eight years; he was in constant turmoil with the opposition as well as with men of his own party, and engaged in

vindictive political feuds against men like Clay, the leader of the opposition. There were social scandals in which the president was implicated, but his political prestige was not injured. Jackson was easily re-elected after one term. His influence elected Martin Van Buren in 1836, but Van Buren could not re-elect himself and the Jacksonian succession was broken in 1840.

Altho there were issues at that time which affected public opinion to some extent the election of 1840 was largely controlled by personalities. The main issue was the Bank, business men opposing the Democratic party on that account. The panic of 1837 was an influence against the party in power. There was also support for the Whig party in the demand it made for internal improvements. Jackson had favored internal improvements by the government, but his party generally denied the constitutional right to expend federal money to construct canals and highways. The election, however, was determined upon personal rather than political issues. People had tired of the domination of Jackson which had been carried on by Van Buren. William Henry Harrison was of the West, a picturesque figure. He had a creditable war record in the war of 1812-14 with England; he had been an Indian fighter of note; and was carried through in a whirlwind of excitement created by Log Cabin demonstrations, coonskin caps, hard cider, and the catchy slogan "Tippecanoe and Tyler, too."

But altho the Whigs won an election they achieved nothing in the way of results. They

had made the mistake of nominating a Democrat for vice-president. John Tyler of Virginia for a long time had been antagonistic to the Jackson régime; so as a matter of expediency the Whigs made him their nominee for vice-president and he became president a month after Harrison was inaugurated. Tyler vetoed all the Whig measures, such as the re-establishment of the Bank and bills for internal improvements; so the party which had won its only election up to that time found itself with a barren victory and in no position to carry out any of its policies.

VII

SLAVERY AND THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY AS
FACTORS—POLK

POLITICALLY the slavery question had been sleeping since the Missouri Compromise of 1820, but the agitation in the North for abolition had continued and in the South extraordinary efforts were made to protect and defend the institution. John Quincy Adams, after his retirement from the presidency, returned to Congress as a member of the House of Massachusetts and devoted his time to furthering the anti-slavery interests, causing a great controversy by presenting the petitions in favor of abolition—an action which caused violent protests on the part of Southerners. It was about this time that Texas entered our politics and stimulated interest in the discussion of slavery because the admission of Texas with her reserved right of division into five States made possible ten more senators favorable to slavery.

While the slavery issue did not elect or defeat presidents in the year 1844, to the extent to which the admission of Texas was involved it determined the nomination by the Democratic party. Van Buren, who had been defeated in 1840 by Harrison, was again a candidate before the Democratic national convention. But a letter written by him a few years before had been discovered which showed that he was against the admission of Texas. The politicians found that

this letter would not prevent Van Buren from having a majority of the delegates and so they devised the two-thirds rule—a rule requiring a nomination by two-thirds of the convention—and defeated Van Buren. James K. Polk of Tennessee was nominated.

That year was the only time that Henry Clay had any chance for the presidency. He would have been elected had not a letter written by him come to light in which he said that he would be glad to see Texas admitted some time in the future. That letter gained Clay no slavery votes and drove away from him the extreme anti-slavery Whigs and abolitionists. These voted for Birney, the anti-slavery Candidate, in sufficient number to give the Polk electors a slight plurality in several close States. In fourteen of the twenty-six States the vote was so close that the result was in doubt several days. Clay was less a pro-slavery man than Polk, but the anti-slavery men were of the fanatical type who neither compromise nor vote for a compromiser, such as Clay had been.

There was also injected into the politics of that year an anti-British issue with the slogan "Fifty-four Forty, or Fight," a demand that the Oregon territory, then in controversy, should include everything up to latitude 54 degrees and 40 minutes, north latitude. This claim was eagerly espoused by the Democrats in that campaign and dropt when Polk became president. The slavery interests were influential in this matter because the additional territory in the far Northwest would have meant free States. The United States lost a magnificent empire

when the boundary line was finally fixt on the 49th parallel.

The tariff as a political issue was of little importance in the early days of the republic. Taxing foreign imports was found to be one of the best means of raising revenue from the beginning of the government. Protection became popular in manufacturing districts and was countenanced by wise statesmen from purely agricultural sections of the country. The tariff came to the front quite frequently, but in the early days not as a vital issue nor as a line of demarcation between the parties. Both parties were divided as respects protection. It was not until 1846 that the tariff became a political issue. The Walker act reducing revenues was passed by a party vote; the Democrats as a party became committed to a low tariff and the Whigs to a protective tariff. This was natural because the great Whig Leader, Henry Clay, was a protectionist.

VIII

THE MEXICAN WAR—TAYLOR

THE admission of Texas brought on the war with Mexico. The country was divided on the annexation and admission of Texas and was likewise divided upon the war with Mexico. It was one of the most unpopular wars in which this country engaged and yet it dominated politics to the extent of electing two presidents. Possibly a war with England for the "Fifty-four-Forty territory" would have been as unpopular in certain sections as was the Mexican War in others, but there were politics and votes in the Mexican War, while it does not appear that "Fifty-four-Forty" ever swayed a single vote.

In 1848 the Whigs chose a war hero as their candidate. They had won an election with a gunpowder man in 1840 and in 1848 they nominated Gen. Zachary Taylor, a resident of Louisiana and a slave owner. They had slogans too, battle cries containing the names of cities he had captured in Mexico; besides, that appealing pet name, "Old Rough-and-Ready," was worth a thousand words of argument about slavery. There is much in a battle cry to inspire troops, and a campaign slogan is a real asset in a political contest. Lewis Cass of Michigan, one of the greatest Democrats of his time, was easily defeated by a hero of the Mexican War.

The Liberty party which had been such an important factor in 1844 was joined by the Free Soilers in 1848 with Birney, the same candidate for president, yet there was a falling off in the total abolition vote. The independents injured the Whigs more than they hurt the Democrats, but divisions in the Democratic party in New York defeated the Cass electors in that State and lost the election. The slavery question and the personality of former President Van Buren were the cause of the Democratic split.

Along about this time and for a number of years thereafter different independent parties developed. One was the anti-Masonic party, which caused an upheaval and overturn in local and state politics, but did not in the least affect presidential elections. The same is true of the Know-Nothing or American party, which flourished for a time, whose purpose was to stop further immigration and restrict the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in politics. While these independent parties alarmed the politicians of those days and reversed political conditions in various States, sometimes electing enough members to the House of Representatives to hold the balance of power, they only once—in 1844—affected the result of a national election, and that effect in ultimate results was contrary to the aims of the independents. The Liberty party, by voting for Birney in 1844, elected Polk and slavery was thereby advanced, as Texas was admitted; the Mexican war followed and the Northwest Territory was lost forever.

It is a curious fact that all these independent political movements—so full of life and vitality

at the time, so intense in human passion and insistent in demands—could surge and eddy about the politics of those days and really accomplish nothing in the way of results, failing in any way to shape the destiny of the nation.

IX

SLAVERY ISSUE LOOMING

EVERY war leaves grave problems to be settled and generally creates new political issues. Such was the case in regard to the Mexican War. What was called "the Compromise of 1850" was supposed to settle the slavery question along with the admission of California as a free State and optional slavery in the territories of Utah and New Mexico, and further restrictions as to fugitive slaves. The "Great Compromiser," Henry Clay, as sponsor or supporter of these measures dug deeper the grave then yawning for the Whig party.

Disposition of the territory acquired from Mexico and the determination as to whether it should be free or slave again revived discussion of slavery and it became the most vital matter in the country. One phase was the proposed extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific Ocean. Then there was the Wilmot Proviso, which held an important place in politics even down to the time of the Civil War. Congress was considering a bill to adjust the Mexican boundary, aiming at the acquisition of additional territory from Mexico. David Wilmot, a Democratic member of the House from Pennsylvania, offered an amendment providing that slavery should never exist in the territory. This amendment was adopted in the House of Repre-

sentatives by Whig and Democratic votes from the Northern States. It was defeated in the Senate where there was a more equal division and a few Northern senators voted with the Southern men. Altho the Wilmot Proviso was never adopted, it continued to be a political issue of supreme importance, particularly whenever there was any legislation pending relating to the territory acquired from Mexico, slavery having become the one great and absorbing question in the minds of people at that time. The Western territories became the bone of contention, because the control of the United States Senate in the interest of or against slavery depended upon whether these territories were free or slave when admitted as States. For many years two States at a time were admitted to the Union, one free and one slave, and an almost equal balance in the Senate was maintained.

But the slavery issue did not elect or defeat a president in those days, even tho it was the most bitterly contested question ever presented to the American Congress. That was because parties were nearly evenly divided in support of and in opposition to slavery. Democrats and Whigs in the South were for slavery. Whigs and Democrats of the North opposed any extension of slavery. And so, altho slavery was such a vital issue and an all-absorbing topic in Congress, it did not determine presidential elections.

X

SLAVERY COMPROMISE—PIERCE

FOR the first time in more than thirty years of agitation, war and legislative compromises on the subject of slavery found a place in the platforms of both the dominant parties in the campaign of 1852. Both parties adopted the compromise of 1850. Both nominated Mexican War heroes, the Whigs selecting the commander-in-chief in Mexico, Gen. Winfield Scott of Virginia, while the Democrats nominated Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire, who had achieved some prominence as a politician and member of the House of Representatives and had been a brigadier general in the Mexican War. The Free Soil party nominated John P. Hale of New Hampshire. Its platform vigorously denounced slavery, and Hale received only 156,149 votes in the whole country. The Democrats carried all but four States with a popular vote of 1,601,474, while General Scott received 1,386,578 votes. It is rather remarkable that the "institution" which had caused so much agitation and had been the subject of so much legislation had such a small adverse vote.

That was the last of the Whig party. Its life was run and it had accomplished nothing for the country.

Before the next presidential election the slavery storm broke out afresh because of the aggressiveness of the Southern Democrats and a desire

on the part of their Northern associates to avoid a rupture. Kansas and Nebraska were organized as Territories by a bill passed by Congress and, altho they were north of the Missouri Compromise line, 36 degrees and 30 minutes north latitude, where slavery was prohibited, the bill left the matter of slavery to the people of the territories. This practically repealed the Missouri Compromise, altho the claim was made that it had already been repealed by the Compromise of 1850. The bill was not passed until after very determined opposition. In the House the Northern Democrats were equally divided 44 for and 44 against. The Northern Whigs, now few in number, and the Free Soilers were all against the bill, while the South was solidly for it. It afforded an opportunity to extend slavery to the whole of the Northwest Territory provided the slavery interests could get control of that vast unpeopled region.

Stephen A. Douglas, Democratic senator from Illinois, supported the bill and originated the famous "Squatter Sovereignty" phrase which became a shibboleth in politics for several years. New settlers on unsurveyed lands in a territory had been termed "squatters," for the reason that they were said to "squat" on the lands. So long as the public domain is unoccupied there is no superior right on government land to that of the squatter, and in those days there was boundless unoccupied territory. It was the squatters in the Territories who were to exercise sovereign right of determining whether they should be free or slave.

The passage of the bill was followed by a tre-

mendous struggle for the control of Kansas. Nebraska was peopled by Northerners. In Kansas there were bloody conflicts between the Free Soilers and the border ruffians for possession of the Territory. It was a time of fraudulent elections and shot-gun control. The administration favored the slavery side, and as it named the Territorial officials it appeared at one time as if the minority, by fraud and violence aided by the Federal officials, might overthrow a very large majority and secure admission of Kansas with a constitution as a slave State.

XI

ANTI-SLAVERY REPUBLICANS DEFEATED—
BUCHANAN

FOR the first time to any noticeable extent the "off-year" or mid-term elections became important in 1854. After the elections that year the Democrats still controlled the Senate, but were in a minority in the House. The anti-Nebraska men were in the majority in the House, but many of them were Know-Nothings. They were called "anti-Nebraska" because they had been elected as opponents of the Nebraska-Kansas bill which permitted the extension of slavery north of the old Missouri Compromise line. In the South the Whig party disappeared, its members joining the Democratic party, which at this time became the only party of the slavery interests. President Pierce, having taken sides with the slave interests in Kansas, committed the national organization to slavery. One of the interesting results of the election of 1854 was the long-drawn-out contest for Speaker of the House. There were 130 ballots before Nathaniel P. Banks of Massachusetts was elected.

The year 1854 witnessed the organization of the Republican party. This party was the first anti-slavery organization that gave evidence of cohesion. It attracted the major portion of the Whigs of the North, the Free Soilers, most of the abolitionists, the majority of the Know-Nothings, and, what was of more importance, a strong ele-

ment of the Democratic party in the North which saw that Southern slavery was dominating their old organization.

The Republican party held its first national convention in 1856, nominating John C. Fremont of California for president. It took a bold stand in its platform, declaring for a liberal construction of the constitution; for internal improvements; for a Pacific railway; against slavery and polygamy in the territories; and against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. This platform did not please the abolitionists, who wanted slavery destroyed root and branch, but it was so positive in opposing slavery extension that it was supported by all but the most fanatical of anti-slavery men.

The Democrats nominated James Buchanan of Pennsylvania for president, a man who had been prominent in public life for many years and for twenty years a candidate for president. The Know-Nothings, still having with them a remnant of the Whig party, nominated Millard Fillmore, who had been elected vice-president with Zachary Taylor and succeeded to the presidency when Taylor died. Fillmore carried only Maryland, while fourteen slave States voted for Buchanan, also New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, California and Wisconsin, giving him 174 electoral votes to 114 for Fremont. The popular vote was: Buchanan, 1,838,169; Fremont, 1,341,264; Fillmore, 874,534; Buchanan's plurality 469,905. The third ticket did not affect the result.

Two events soon after the accession of Buchanan proved disastrous to the Democratic

party, which had practically controlled the country since 1800, as the election of Whig candidates in two campaigns was comparatively unimportant and unfruitful as to results. The first of these was the adoption of the Lecompton constitution in Kansas containing a slavery provision. It was brought about by force and fraud and was rejected by Congress. The other was the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, holding that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional and that a slave was property and could not be a citizen of the United States and had no standing in the courts. The court's decision aroused tremendous excitement in the North and fanned the abolition movement into a fierce flame.

In 1858 occurred the famous Lincoln-Douglas debate, in which all the issues of slavery were discusst. This debate resulted in the defeat of Lincoln for the Senate and his election to the presidency two years later; also the election of Douglas to the Senate and his defeat for president in 1860. In the Congressional election of 1858 the Republicans showed great strength, and tho they had the largest number of members in the House they did not have a majority. The country that year showed that it was not yet ready to entrust the government to a declared anti-slavery party.

XII

EXTENSION VS. RESTRICTION OF SLAVERY—LINCOLN

THE year 1860 was the most important politically in the history of the country. The final stage in dodging, compromise, and makeshift had passed. The Republican party in 1856 had cast 1,341,264 votes on a declaration antagonistic to slavery. It had been growing more aggressive and there was every indication that it had been growing stronger. Owing to the advance of anti-slavery sentiment in the North secession was openly advocated by Southern men. A crisis had been reached to be settled first by the peaceful method of the ballot and finally by a bloody conflict between the sections.

National party platforms for once became of supreme importance. This was especially true of the Democratic convention. For months the split in the Democratic party had been widening and the antagonisms growing more intense. The rival leaders were Jefferson Davis of Mississippi and Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois. They fought their first battles in the Senate and announced their platforms. Douglas had no support to speak of in the Senate, but could boast of almost solid Democratic backing in the North.

The Democratic convention met at Charleston, South Carolina. The Douglas men were in the majority and after a long struggle adopted the Douglas platform which recognized that "differences of opinion exist in the Democratic party over the institution of slavery." It then went

on to declare that the party would abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court on questions of constitutional law; that the party was in favor of the acquisition of Cuba; that laws of state legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the fugitive slave law were hostile to the constitution and revolutionary in their effect; that as to "the Territorial governments, the measure of restriction whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal constitution on the power of Territorial legislation over the subject of domestic relations," should be determined by the Supreme Court.

This plank was wholly unsatisfactory to the Southerners, who proposed one which declared that a Territorial legislature had no power to abolish slavery in a territory; nor to prohibit the introduction of slaves therein; nor to destroy the right of property in slaves by any legislation whatever; and that it was the duty of the Federal government to protect, when necessary, slave property in the Territories.

When this plank was rejected and the Northern plank adopted, a number of Southern State delegations withdrew, a secession in politics which many then believed was to be followed later by a secession of States from the Union.

After many ballots, with Douglas having a large majority but not the necessary two-thirds, the convention adjourned to meet at Baltimore. On re-assembling the Douglas men, in States where the Southerners had withdrawn, sent other delegations, and, after more fierce wrangling, they were seated. Then the remaining extreme Southern men withdrew and organized a conven-

tion of their own. They adopted the Southern slavery platform and nominated John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky for president and Joseph Lane of Oregon for vice-president. The Northern men named Douglas for president and Herschel V. Johnson of Georgia for vice-president.

The Republican national convention met at Chicago and adopted a platform favoring protection, the construction of Pacific railways, and the homestead law. On the question of slavery the platform asserted that each State had the right to control its own domestic institutions; denounced the attempt to force the Lecompton constitution upon Kansas; denounced as a dangerous political heresy the dogma that the Constitution carried slavery into the Territories; denied the power of Congress or of a Territorial legislature to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States. It also denounced the talk of disunion which had for months been rampant among Southerners.

There were two potential aspirants for the Republican nomination, and a number of "favorite sons," as candidates from various States with little chance of a nomination have come to be known. William H. Seward of New York was the leading candidate, and it was generally supposed that he would be chosen. Abraham Lincoln of Illinois stood next and the tremendous exertions put forth in his behalf secured his nomination on the third ballot. Subsequent events proved the transcendent wisdom of Lincoln's selection. Hannibal Hamlin of Maine was nominated for vice-president.

But still another convention was held, composed of old-time Whigs and men of other days who called themselves the Constitutional Union party and named John Bell of Tennessee and Edward Everett of Massachusetts as candidates. The platform evaded the slavery question and declared for "the Constitution of the country; the union of the States, and the enforcement of the laws."

With the Democratic party sectionally divided; with the North or free States larger in number and population, together with the continued talk of secession by Southern men, it early became apparent that the Republicans would win. Lincoln carried every Northern free State except New Jersey—there the electoral vote was divided, a part going to Douglas. The electoral vote stood Lincoln 180, Breckenridge 72, Bell 39, and Douglas 12. The slave States, with the exception of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, voted for Breckenridge. Those three States voted for Bell. The popular vote was Lincoln 1,866,352, Douglas 1,375,157, Breckenridge 845,763, Bell 589,581; Lincoln's plurality over Douglas 491,195.

No combination of figures can show that by uniting the votes of other candidates any one of them could have been elected over Lincoln. He had a majority over all in all the States he carried except California and Oregon. In nine States of the South Lincoln received no votes.

Secession of the South followed rapidly on the heels of the election and the Civil War followed secession. Thus the election of 1860 became momentous—the greatest political event in the history of the country.

XIII

THE SOLDIER VOTE AND WAR ISSUES—LINCOLN AND GRANT

ONE presidential campaign and a great war was enough to settle a political issue that had been agitating the country for forty years. Slavery was out of politics after three years of war. In 1864 the election turned solely upon the war. Naturally the Republicans renominated Lincoln, altho there were strong efforts made by men who still misunderstood Lincoln and fancied they were greater men, to secure the nomination for themselves. In nominating Lincoln a second time the Republicans made the strange mistake of setting aside Hamlin and nominating Andrew Johnson of Tennessee for vice-president. Johnson had been a Democrat, but altho from a slave State was an intense Union man. It was at that time considered "good politics" to hold out an olive branch to the South and also to the "War Democrats," as many men were called who were stedfast for the Union, but clung to their own party.

Politicians in desperate cases will take a gambler's chance. Only that can account for the nomination by the Democrats of a war general on a platform declaring the war a failure, which they did in 1864. It was the intention to catch the voters who were against the war—and there were hundreds of thousands of them in the

Northern States—and also the soldier vote, for Gen. George B. McClellan was beyond question a popular man with the soldiers. George H. Pendleton of Ohio was named as the candidate for vice-president.

Strange tho it may seem, there was a grave doubt as to the outcome in the mind of Lincoln at one time during the campaign and he actually made a memorandum saying he expected defeat. At that time the States in rebellion did not vote and the Northern and border States determined the result. There may have been reason for the pessimistic feeling that existed and affected others besides Lincoln; but long before the canvass closed, a succession of Union victories made the Democratic declaration that “the war was a failure” absolutely ridiculous. Lincoln won with 212 electoral votes as against 21 for McClellan. But one important fact should not be overlooked. McClellan received 1,808,725 votes and Lincoln 2,216,067. It seems to show that there were one million and eight hundred thousand voters in the Northern and border States who did not approve of the war for the Union. Possibly there were many who did not believe that declaration but preferred to vote the ticket with the old party label, even if the platform was not all they wished or the candidate not entirely satisfactory. Eleven Southern States did not vote.

In 1868 the only significance of the presidential election was that a war hero is a good vote getter. Gen Ulysses S. Grant, the greatest figure in the military world at that time, was nominated by the Republicans and easily defeated

Horatio Seymour of New York, who was nominated by the Democrats. Schuyler Colfax of Indiana was nominated with Grant and Gen. Frank P. Blair, Jr., of Missouri was nominated with Seymour. Vice-presidential candidates and party platforms under the conditions then prevailing were of no particular importance. Grant had 214 electoral votes and Seymour 80. Seymour carried New York. His other votes came from southern and border States. There was significance in the popular vote. Grant had 3,015,071, and Seymour 2,709,613. This showed that the Democrats were returning to their old allegiance. The Lincoln majority of 1864 was cut down one hundred thousand. Four southern States did not vote.

XIV

LIBERAL REPUBLICAN MOVEMENT—GRANT VS.
GREELEY

THE presidential election of 1872 developed a strong independent movement in the Republican party. Many party leaders were dissatisfied with Grant. The Republicans had been in power for twelve years, and it always happens under like conditions that ruptures occur within a party having had a long lease of power and demand for a change follows. In 1872 it culminated in the Liberal Republican movement. As to the regulars, or "Stalwarts" (as they were beginning to be called), they were satisfied with Grant and he was unanimously re-nominated at Philadelphia. Henry Wilson of Massachusetts was nominated for vice-president.

The Liberal Republicans met at Cincinnati in a gathering which was called a "convention of cranks," of which many famous stories were written. Many men who had been prominent in the Republican party were among the number. Conspicuous leaders were editors of Republican newspapers. There were also men who had been Democrats but despaired of that party's success and joined the independent movement hoping to overthrow the regular Republicans. To the surprise of many of those who thought they had control of the convention Horace Greeley was nominated. He was then and had been for many years editor of the *New York Tribune*, was an

old-time Whig, an early organizer of the Republican party, and one of the greatest journalists the country ever knew. B. Gratz Brown of Missouri was nominated for vice-president. The Democratic convention at Baltimore endorsed these nominations, and the most anomalous situation that ever appeared in politics was the result. Horace Greeley, who had written and said more bitter words than any other man against the Democratic party became the standard bearer of that party. Charles O'Connor of New York became the candidate of a small wing of the Democratic party that would not support Greeley.

It was a campaign of bitter contention and abuse. Much was recalled regarding Greeley by the Republicans. It was remembered that he had been a severe, even carping critic of Lincoln during the war; that it was Greeley who said of the secession movement, "Let the erring sisters depart in peace"; that he had signed the bail bond of Jefferson Davis, president of the late Confederacy. Few candidates were ever made to suffer as this old man, and his defeat no doubt caused his death, for he died before the electoral vote was counted. In that campaign was first heard the "bloody shirt" slogan, which was ever after charged against the Republicans when they used the Civil War as an issue.

In those days there were "October States," as States were called which held elections for state offices in October. The important October States were Ohio and Indiana and they generally forecast the result of the presidential election. In 1872 they showed conclusively that the Re-

publicans would have a great victory. And in November Grant was elected with a popular plurality of 762,991, with 286 electoral votes against 63 for Greeley. The O'Connor vote was less than 30,000. That year there was a temperance candidate who polled 5,608 votes. He was the first to run on the prohibition issue.

Emerging from that campaign it looked as if the Democratic party was hopelessly wrecked, and yet in 1874, so wonderful is the power of political recuperation, the party won a sweeping victory in the Congressional elections. The Democrats in the Southern States were regaining control which had been taken from them by the enfranchisement of the negroes. The newly enfranchised negroes had been supported in their voting rights by the force of arms of the federal administration.

XV

THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION—HAYES VS. TILDEN

THERE were certain factors at work for the Democratic party which had an important bearing upon the succeeding presidential election in 1876. The Liberal Republican revolt in 1872 was not without substance. It had a deep undercurrent of intelligent hostility to Grant, and but for the nomination of Greeley might have shown greater strength. During Grant's second term there were a number of developments which hurt the Republican party. One of the most important was the Credit Mobilier scandal in Congress, another was the Whisky Ring scandal, and still another was the scandal in the War Department resulting in the impeachment of Secretary Belknap. All tended to discredit the administration and injure the Republican party, tho none of them touched the personal integrity of President Grant.

The Republicans met in national convention in 1876 at Cincinnati; it was generally supposed that James G. Blaine of Maine would be nominated, but he was defeated by a series of untoward events. He had been an able Speaker of the House for six years and a brilliant minority leader against the Democrats in the House. While the convention was in session he had a serious stroke which injured his chances in the convention, but his defeat was chiefly due to Ros-

coe Conkling. Long before in a debate in the House he had a sharp tilt with Conkling and called the New Yorker a "strutting peacock." The implacable Conkling never forgave an enemy and his control of the New York delegation with the aid of the political bosses who were unfriendly to Blaine prevented his nomination. Blaine's popularity was so great that he would have been elected had he been nominated. After many ballots the convention nominated Rutherford B. Hayes. He had been a major general in the war and governor of Ohio, but was really almost unknown. William A. Wheeler of New York was nominated for vice-president.

The Democrats met at St. Louis and nominated Samuel J. Tilden of New York and Thomas A. Hendricks of Indiana—a very strong ticket combining two elements in the party which was divided on the money question, the East favoring what was called a sound currency and return to specie payments and the West inclining to further issue of paper money or greenbacks. In fact so strong was this movement that a Greenback party was organized and nominated Peter Cooper of New York for president.

The October States showed that the election would be very close, Indiana going Democratic and Ohio so close as to show a trend toward Democracy in the North. The South, except in a few States in which the Republican white men (known as "carpet-baggers") and the blacks were in control, was solidly Democratic. Tilden carried New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Indiana in the North and enough Southern States to give him 184 electoral votes, with the

States of Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina claimed by both parties.

The situation which developed was peculiar and perplexing. Under the law for counting the electoral votes for president and vice-president the two Houses of Congress meet in joint session to make the canvass. If there is a contested case the joint session ends and each House votes separately on the question of which set of electors has been chosen and how the vote of the State should be counted. As the Senate was Republican and the House Democratic there was in 1877 sure to be a division and deadlock over the States in dispute. To meet this condition and adjust the differences a commission was provided. It consisted of five senators, three of whom were Republicans and two Democrats; five Representatives, three of whom were Democrats and two Republicans; and five members of the Supreme Court. It was provided that two Republicans and two Democrats of the Supreme Court would be chosen and it was assumed that the fifth would be David Davis, formerly a Democrat, then a Lincoln Republican (appointed by Lincoln to the Supreme Court bench), and finally, in 1877, an independent in politics. About that time the Illinois legislature elected Davis to the United States Senate and he retired from the Supreme Court. The fifth member of the electoral commission from the Court had to be a Republican as there was no other possible selection, and that determined the presidential contest. Every vital question before the commission was decided by a vote of eight to seven, on strict party lines. If Davis had been a member of the

commission, it is altogether probable that Tilden would have been president instead of Hayes.

The final result caused fierce denunciation by the Democrats, who declared they had been fraudulently deprived of the presidency. As Tilden had a popular plurality of 250,935 there was some reason for their claim. No Democrat ever has conceded that Hayes was honestly elected and there were many Republicans who had grave doubts on the subject.

XVI

THIRD TERM ISSUE—GARFIELD

THE campaign of 1880 settled—for a time, and some thought forever—the third term issue. General Grant made a triumphal tour of the world after he retired from the presidency and returned an idolized hero. His friends made the greatest possible effort to secure his nomination in the Republican convention which assembled in Chicago. Blaine was again a candidate and so was John Sherman of Ohio. Grant had the support of Conkling in New York, Cameron in Pennsylvania, and Logan in Illinois, with a large number of Southern delegates. They did not have a majority of the convention, however, and the combined strength of the opposition was able to sustain a precedent—established in the convention of 1876—and break the so-called unit rule. This permitted delegates to vote by congressional districts and prevented the delegations from the three big States from voting solidly for Grant, so he went down to defeat with 306 delegates standing firm for him to the last. After many ballots James A. Garfield of Ohio was nominated with Chester A. Arthur of New York as the candidate for vice-president.

The Democrats in 1880 again tried a war hero as a candidate, nominating General Winfield S. Hancock, of the army, whose legal residence was

in New Jersey. William H. English of Indiana was named for vice-president. The platform declaration was mainly a denunciation of the alleged fraud of 1876, a commendation of their last candidate, Tilden, and a general attack upon Republican legislation and past administrations. General Hancock was as popular as any of the general run of officers of the Civil War. He earned the sobriquet "Hancock the Superb" by his gallant fighting at Gettysburg, but he was not in the same class with Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan. He was in no sense a politician. Garfield had a creditable war record, besides he had taken high rank as a member of the House. At the time of his nomination he was senator-elect from Ohio.

In 1880 the political parties were more evenly divided than at any time in the history of the country, according to the popular vote, for Garfield's plurality over Hancock was only 7,018 while he had 214 electoral votes as against 155 for Hancock. Garfield carried every Northern State except New Jersey.

James B. Weaver of Iowa was the candidate of the Greenback party and polled 307,306 votes while 10,305 votes were cast for Neal Dow, the prohibition candidate. These independent candidates did not affect the result. Garfield would have been elected if all of their votes had been cast for Hancock, an utter improbability even if the independents had not been in the field.

XVII

MUGWUMP INDEPENDENCY—CLEVELAND

JAMES G. Blaine secured in 1884 at Chicago the Republican nomination that he had sought in two previous conventions. But his success at that time left a train of bitterness which no doubt contributed to his defeat. He was nominated in a field of candidates which included as chief rivals John Sherman and Chester A. Arthur. Arthur had succeeded to the Presidency when Garfield was assassinated. Garfield in six months had caused such divisions in the Republican party as promised to wreck it along with his administration. Conkling and Tom Platt had resigned as senators from New York because of a break with the president over patronage. Then Garfield was removed by the bullet of a fanatic and Arthur, one of the stalwart faction in New York, succeeded to the presidency. He gave the country one of the best administrations it has ever had. There was nothing spectacular nor exciting during his term in the White House, but there was a period of content and prosperity. Arthur should have been re-nominated to ensure a Republican victory. He would have carried New York and made the election safe. Blaine had been accused of connection with a number of improper concerns. He was the target for a systematic attack upon his honesty. Besides there was an element, mainly

located in New York and called "Mugwumps," composed of men who had formerly affiliated with the Republican party, but were bitterly antagonistic to Blaine.

The Democrats also met at Chicago and nominated Grover Cleveland of New York and Thomas A. Hendricks of Indiana. Cleveland had been elected governor of New York in the previous state election and had attained a prominence that secured him the nomination over other aspirants who had long been wheelhorses in the Democratic party.

Benjamin F. Butler of Massachusetts was the nominee of the Greenbackers, and John P. St. John the candidate of the prohibitionists. In such a close election as that of 1884 it can be shown that the independent candidates changed the result, altho Butler had only 133,825 votes and St. John 151,809 votes. If all, or even a large proportion of the St. John votes in New York had been cast for Blaine he would have been elected, for New York then, as in many years, was the pivotal and deciding State. But no one can say where the St. John votes would have gone any more than they can say what those who voted for Butler would have done if he had not been in the field.

Probably no presidential election was more influenced by a set of mere circumstances than that of 1884, save only that of 1916. Just as it seemed certain that Blaine would carry New York and be elected, there was a great gathering in New York a few days before the election and among the speakers was one Rev. Dr. Burchard, who will live in history as an over-zealous minister of

the gospel who with four words defeated Blaine and elected Cleveland president. In an impetuous and unguarded moment he declared that the country was not to be turned over to the party of "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion." The political imp that put in the mind of Burchard that alliterative phrase is responsible for the defeat of Blaine for president and the election of Cleveland. The phrase was taken up eagerly by the Democrats and published broadcast, and the result was that an influential church, which had thus been publicly insulted in a Republican meeting and ignominiously associated with an unpopular rebellion and an unpopular liquor traffic, showed its resentment at the polls and Blaine was defeated.

Even so, with the Burchard handicap, with the Mugwumps against him, with the prohibitionists at that time drawn almost wholly from the Republicans, Blaine lost New York by less than 1,200 votes. It was charged that in some of the districts of New York City and Brooklyn many Butler votes were counted for Cleveland, a sufficient number to carry the State for him.

After several days of doubt it was finally determined that the Cleveland electors in New York had a plurality of the vote and Cleveland's election was conceded. He had 219 electoral votes and Blaine 182. Cleveland's popular plurality was 62,683, which shows that the country was very evenly divided.

It should be stated in connection with the popular vote in presidential elections that after the South had fully regained control of the former slave States the counting of votes in that section

was more or less in the realm of fiction and large majorities were easily obtained. In fact that system has continued in force up to the present time and large Democratic majorities in Southern States are first among the bulletins on every presidential election night.

XVIII

PROTECTIONIST TARIFF—HARRISON

ALTHO there had been differences of opinion in regard to the tariff, wherein there were strong advocates of protection and equally strong advocates of free trade, it is not apparent that any presidential election was decided upon the tariff issue until 1888. Previous to the Civil War there had been differences of opinion, but they were not confined to parties, altho it may be said that a majority of the Whig party was protectionist. At the same time there were many Democrats who were also inclined toward protection while the really free trade element was confined largely to the agricultural districts. There were other questions of such tremendous interest that the tariff was not considered important. So little did the tariff figure in politics that it was not mentioned in either of the political platforms of 1856, the first year that the Republican party had a presidential ticket in the field.

The Republicans may be said to have taken protection as one of their tenets by a slight reference to it in the platform of 1860 which declared that in the adjustment of impost duties they should be so levied as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country. Four years of war set aside such comparatively trivial things as the tariff and there was no mention of this issue in the platforms of 1864.

Of course during the war and for a number of years afterward, in order to pay the war interest and debt, a very considerable amount of revenue was raised by duties on foreign importations. But it is evident that the Democratic party in 1868 began to realize that there was a political issue in the tariff, for in that year it declared for a tariff for revenue. There was no mention of the subject in the Republican platform. In 1872 the Liberal Republicans, recognizing the differences which existed throughout the country relative to the tariff, adopted a platform which "remitted to the congressional districts the respective systems of protection and free trade." That year the Democrats swallowed the Liberal Republican platform as well as the ticket. The Republican platform declared that revenues raised upon foreign importations should be so adjusted as to secure remunerative wages to labor and promote industries.

By 1876 it was realized that the tariff of Civil War days was high; so the Democrats denounced the existing tariff and declared for custom house taxation only for revenue. The Republicans asserted that as the revenues must be derived largely from duties on foreign importations, the rates should be adjusted so as to promote the interests of labor and of industries. In 1880 the Democrats, believing that they had a great and overpowering issue in the action of the electoral commission which seated Hayes in the White House, devoted most of their platform declarations to the denunciation of that alleged fraud and did not mention the tariff. The Republicans reaffirmed their declaration of 1876.

In 1884 the Democrats touched the tariff issue somewhat gently, demanding that it be revised in a spirit of fairness to all interests, in the reduction of taxes taking care not to injure any industries but rather to promote their healthy growth. The Republicans that year took a little stronger position and declared that the imposition of duties on foreign imports should not be for revenue only, but so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and to the rights and wages of American labor.

The contest in Congress over the tariff went on irrespective of the declarations of party platforms. Soon after the Democrats gained control of the House of Representatives, they undertook to bring about revision of the tariff in what was known as the two Morrison bills, presented at different times. These bills were defeated by a division in the Democratic party, as there was a strong protective element in the party led by Samuel J. Randall of Pennsylvania, who was Speaker for several terms. After Randall's defeat for Speaker and Carlisle, who stood for reduction of the tariff, had been made his successor, there were renewed efforts on the part of the tariff reform Democrats to secure revision, altho the protection wing of the party was still in evidence. During the last part of President Cleveland's first administration the first real headway toward revising the tariff downward was accomplished under the leadership of Roger Q. Mills of Texas, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

When the two great political parties lined up for the campaign of 1888 the tariff was the main

issue before the people. The Democrats of the House had put through the Mills bill, which greatly reduced the rates of duty on foreign goods. The Republicans of the Senate rejected the entire measure and adopted a protection substitute. As there was nothing of importance then agitating the country, the tariff for the first time became a deciding and dominating issue. It was made more so by the nominations, for the personalities and alleged scandals which disgraced the campaign of 1884 could not be an issue with the candidates named in 1888. Cleveland had lived down the scandalous charges hurled at him during the previous campaign; besides, it is seldom that charges of dishonesty or of personal misconduct are made—in a public manner—against a president. There are certain proprieties that our people recognize, and one of them is respect for the office of president.

The Democratic national convention met at St. Louis and unanimously re-nominated Cleveland. Vice-president Hendricks had died in office, and another old Democratic wheelhorse, Allen G. Thurman of Ohio, was nominated for vice-president. The tariff plank in the platform criticised the Republicans for “resisting and preventing reformation of unjust and unequal tax laws,” and said the Democratic party would continue the struggle to reform those laws in accordance with the last national platform; the revision of the tax laws to be made with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor. The plank also endorsed the Mills bill then pending in Congress.

The Republican national convention assembled

in Chicago. There was a spirited contest for the nomination, altho there was a strong undercurrent for Blaine and it was believed by many that he was to be nominated. Blaine, more wise than he was four years later, took himself out of consideration as a candidate by a cable from Scotland where he was spending the summer. In the Republican party at the convention of 1888 appeared first that spirit which in after years was called "progressive." It clustered around the candidacy of Walter Q. Gresham, then a circuit judge who had been Postmaster General and Secretary of the Treasury in the cabinet of President Arthur. Gresham was living in Illinois tho technically a resident of Indiana. Other candidates were Allison of Iowa, Depew of New York, Sherman of Ohio, and Benjamin Harrison of Indiana, who was nominated after several ballots. It was a good selection. Indiana was a close State; Harrison had a good soldier record, and his six years in the Senate had given him considerable prominence; besides, there was no flaw in his personal or public career. Levi P. Morton of New York was nominated for vice-president.

The platform outside of the tariff plank was of no particular importance. "We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection which must be maintained," was the emphatic declaration written and read by William McKinley.

And so the tariff became for the first time the real issue in a presidential campaign.

There was a side issue which proved important—it may have been a determining factor in the

election; at all events, it was of material assistance to the Republicans. President Cleveland vetoed hundreds of private pension bills passed for the benefit of Union soldiers. The soldiers of the Civil War were then a power in politics, and while the great majority of them were Republicans, those pension vetoes no doubt turned many soldier votes to Harrison which would otherwise have been cast for Cleveland.

Harrison was elected, carrying the doubtful States of New York and Indiana. New York was again the pivotal and deciding State, Harrison carrying it by 15,000 plurality, which gave him the election.

At that time there was a "solid South," consisting of all the former slave States. From the time that three of them were counted for Hayes in 1876 until the first break in 1904—with one single exception to be hereafter noted—those States voted solidly Democratic. No competent Republican manager in all those years based any campaign hopes upon the possibility of Republican success in any of the States of the "solid South." They were solidly Democratic for reasons which will be explained in a later chapter.

In 1888 there was a prohibition ticket and a Union Labor ticket in the field, but neither that year nor for many years did these minor independent tickets cut any figure or influence the result of presidential elections.

The tariff, when it did become the political issue, was of such supreme importance that it dominated all other subjects for many years. The most striking result of Republican success in 1888, which gave to the Republicans, in addi-

tion of the presidency, control of both houses of Congress, was the enactment of the McKinley tariff bill. In that section west of the Great Lakes and north of the Missouri Compromise line, the campaign cry of 1888 was that the tariff must be revised by its friends. By that was meant that an inevitable reduction should be made by those in favor of adequate protection. One necessity for reduction was caused by reason of a large surplus piling up in the Treasury on account of the normal receipts exceeding the expenditures, something that has not been enjoyed in this country in thirty years and which few now living can expect to see again.

When the Republicans took control in the Fifty-first Congress, they adopted the Reed rules—then severely condemned, but ever since acknowledged as the most sensible parliamentary reform ever known—they revised the tariff, but provided for a reduction of the surplus in the Treasury by increasing the rates to a point which would reduce foreign imports, taking a duty off sugar and giving a bounty on sugar produced in this country. The first result was an outrageous and uncalled for increase of prices of every kind of commodity. The McKinley bill was passed a month before the mid-term election of 1890 and its effect was immediate. In the Congressional election that year the Republicans suffered the most disastrous defeat they ever experienced. The issue was plain. The high tariff and increase in the price of every article sold, whether or not affected by the tariff, accounted for the overwhelming defeat of the party which had won a presidential election on the tariff issue.

XIX

THE TARIFF AND FREE SILVER—CLEVELAND

BETWEEN the presidential elections of 1888 and 1892 there grew up the People's party, or Populist party, as it was generally called. It was the first third party movement since the Republican party became a major political organization that seemed really to have the elements of growth and the possibility of displacing one or the other of the older parties. It had its origin in the Farmer's Alliance, an organization which grew out of the general dissatisfaction of the farmers of the West, who thought they were not getting their share of the prosperity of which the country boasted. In 1889 there was at St. Louis, a meeting of the Alliance in conjunction with dissatisfied labor elements. In 1890 there was a convention at Ocala, Florida, which was the birthplace of the Populist party. The elements of dissatisfaction and protest met there and declared for many reforms, considered ridiculous at that time, but nearly all of which have been since put into effect by legislation or executive order. One of the declarations which never found its way into legislation was for the free coinage of silver.

Altho silver was a troublesome question at that time it had not developed into a political issue. In 1873, when silver was little used as money, it was demonetized and the gold dollar made the

unit of value. The greatly increased production of silver in the mountain States about that time created a demand for its restoration as a money metal. The Western farming States, then heavily in debt, wanted silver or cheaper money with which to pay their creditors. It was part of a general demand for more money—inflation. In Congress silver became an absorbing question and several makeshift bills were passed for the utilization of silver, but none was satisfactory either to the silver men of the West or the gold men of the East. The Republicans in 1890 supplanted the Bland-Allison act, under which \$2,000,000 was coined in silver a month, with the so-called Sherman act, which provided for the purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver each month and issuance of Treasury notes in payment. This bill was passed by a strict party vote. It was satisfactory neither to the gold men of the Democratic party, of whom there were few, nor to the silver men who demanded free silver coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1, meaning that the weight of the silver dollar should be sixteen times the weight of the gold dollar. The bill was passed by the Republicans because they were in a position where they felt it a political necessity “to do something for silver,” altho it was far from what any of them desired.

The tariff, however, and not silver, was the campaign issue of 1892. Harrison was re-nominated by the Republicans at Minneapolis, but so unpopular had he become personally during his term in the White House, and so many the antagonisms he had created among leading Republicans, that he had barely a majority of the dele-

gates, and this majority was made up from the Southern States and controlled by patronage. Whitelaw Reid of the New York *Tribune* was named for vice-president. Blaine was persuaded to be a candidate and resigned as Secretary of State while the convention was in session. He received less than one-fourth of the votes in the convention.

Cleveland, who had been defeated on the tariff issue in 1888, was the idol of the tariff reformers who assembled at Chicago in 1892. He was nominated on the first ballot, altho the two-thirds rule prevailed; however, he did not have the support of his own State, whose delegates everywhere proclaimed that he could not carry New York and was sure to be defeated. Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois was named for vice-president.

Both parties adhered to their tariff positions. "We re-affirm the American doctrine of protection," boldly declared the Republicans; while the Democrats said: "We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few." The Democrats maintained also that the Federal government had no power to impose or collect tariff duties except for purposes of revenue only.

On the silver question both parties evaded the free coinage issue, but made declarations in favor of the money of the Constitution, gold and silver.

The Populist party met at Omaha and nominated James B. Weaver of Iowa for president. A radical platform was adopted and the declara-

tion for free coinage was firm and plain. Weaver carried Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, and had one vote each in North Dakota and Oregon. He had a popular vote of 1,041,028. The Populist party was so strong in 1890, the first year it entered politics, that it elected two United States senators and half a dozen members of the House. In 1892 one more Populist senator was elected and that party held the balance of power in three state legislatures and prevented the election of senators.

The country was still disturbed over high prices and the Democrats made the most of that condition, making their campaign almost solely on the tariff. Cleveland won a signal victory. His popular plurality was 380,810. Besides carrying all of the "solid South" States, he easily carried the four doubtful States, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Indiana, and the heretofore rock-ribbed Republican States, California, Illinois, and Wisconsin, securing also five electors in Michigan, one in North Dakota, and one in Ohio. He had 277 electoral votes as against 145 for Harrison. It should be mentioned, however, that Illinois and Wisconsin were carried by reason of an intense religious disturbance among both Catholics and Lutherans caused by legislation enacted by Republican legislatures in those States. The Homestead strike, where striking workers were shot down by Pinkerton men at one of the great steel plants in Pennsylvania, had its effect. Then there was another secret and very effective agency at work for the Democrats. Harrison's Commissioner of Indian Affairs had deeply offended the Roman

Catholics by reason of his methods in dealing with the church schools on Indian reservations, and this was used against the administration. Altogether there was a combination of conditions against the Republican party. Weaver's large vote was drawn from the Republican party and his electoral votes came from Republican States. But the Populist votes were mostly in the West. They would not have changed the result in the doubtful States of the East if they had all been cast for Harrison.

One important result of the election of 1892 was that the Democrats not only elected their president but also secured a majority in both the Senate and House. For the first time since 1860 they had control of every branch of the government. It was generally believed that they would carry out their previous declarations, and the business world looked forward to a large increase of foreign importations as a result of a revision of the tariff on the basis of a tariff for revenue only which was naturally anticipated.

Altho the Democrats had won two-victories—one congressional and the other presidential—on the tariff issue, President Cleveland called an extra session of Congress in 1893 to legislate on the money question; that is, to repeal the Sherman silver purchase act. The country was suffering on account of a severe panic. There was general business stagnation and low prices prevailed, particularly for agricultural products. Money was difficult to obtain and failures of banks and other business institutions were so numerous as to create a very great depression. The revenues of the government fell off to such

an extent that it was necessary to sell bonds to meet current expenses. The bonds were sold ostensibly to replenish the gold reserve, but the proceeds were actually necessary to pay the government's obligations. There arose a general clamor for the repeal of the silver purchase act, which was held responsible for the money panic and business depression, particularly by the people of the East. The silver purchase act was adding \$4,500,000 a month to the currency of the country, which at that time was said to be dangerous inflation. The two great parties were divided on the question of repeal; but a large majority of Republicans in both the Senate and the House favored repeal, and a sufficient number of Democrats joined them to pass the measure after one of the most protracted filibusters that ever occurred in Congress.

Tariff revision was taken up when the regular session of Congress met, but it was not accomplished without causing further divisions in the Democratic party. The party as a whole could not unite and stand upon the many platforms which in past years had declared for a tariff for revenue only, and the bill that was finally passed failed to receive the signature of President Cleveland on the ground that he considered it a measure of "perfidy and dishonor," as it did not carry out the platform pledges. The Democrats had a very small majority in the Senate and there were enough protection Democrats in that body to force a revision of the Wilson House bill and make it the Gorman Senate bill, in which form it passed late in the summer and became a law without the president's signature.

Divided on the tariff, hopelessly split on silver, with the whole country suffering under a disastrous business panic, the Democratic party came out a complete wreck from the congressional campaign of 1894. From a good-sized working majority in the House the Democratic membership was reduced to 104 members, while the Republicans elected 248 members—a larger majority than they had even in Civil War times.

XX

GOLD STANDARD VS. FREE SILVER—MCKINLEY

THE presidential election of 1896 was fought on the issue of the gold standard against the free coinage of silver. The Republicans, who had been in the ascendency as a result of the congressional election of 1894, had decided to make a campaign on the tariff. For that reason William McKinley was nominated. McKinley's nomination was brought about by the efforts of Marcus A. Hanna of Cleveland, Ohio. He, as an ardent protectionist and a warm personal admirer of McKinley, began and conducted to a successful finish a business campaign for the nomination of McKinley. There was a demand in many sections of the country for McKinley's nomination. His name was associated with the tariff law which had been denounced from one end of the country to the other, upon which the Democrats had won two elections. But there had come an intense reaction. There was a demand for the McKinley tariff law, and coupled with it was the demand that McKinley should be president. There were other candidates in the field, notably Thomas B. Reed of Maine, who was equally responsible for the McKinley bill and as much of a protectionist as McKinley. Reed, however, had neither the same amount of advertising nor the personal popularity of the Ohio candidate. Levi P. Morton of New York and Senator William B. Allison of Iowa were also

candidates, but long before the convention assembled at St. Louis it was known that McKinley would be nominated. Garrett A. Hobart of New Jersey was named for vice-president.

The real contest at the Republican convention in 1896 was over the money plank. Altho the Republicans wanted to make the fight on the tariff, and a great many of the leaders wanted to straddle the money question, there were determined men handling the affairs of the convention who knew that the time had arrived to meet and settle the question as to the money standard. And altho the money plank was framed with a sop to the silver men, providing for bimetallism when the consent of other nations was obtained, there was an emphatic declaration in favor of the gold standard. On account of that declaration many delegates from the silver-producing States left the convention and the Republican party, many of them never to return.

But while this money plank was the most important issue, the Republicans were none the less insistent on protection and practically reiterated past declarations, saying: "We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity."

Soon after the repeal of the silver purchase act and the further division in the Democratic ranks on account of the tariff, a number of leading Democrats organized for the purpose of controlling the Democratic national convention of 1896 and forcing a declaration in favor of the free coinage of silver. The movement progressed

so rapidly that when the Democrats assembled in Chicago, three weeks after the Republican national convention in St. Louis, a large majority were in favor of free silver and had control of the convention. But they had no candidate, nor did they have one until William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska had addressed the convention in a speech upon the party platform, closing with his famous "cross of gold and crown of thorns" phrase. Then the men there assembled realized that they had a presidential candidate in their midst.

There had been a sharp contest over the platform, and after the emphatic declaration in favor of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 without the consent of any other nation had been adopted, many delegates favoring the gold standard refused to participate further in the proceedings and did not vote. It is true that the platform also contained some other features obnoxious to the conservative element, notably the condemnation of the courts. The Democrats who sturdily advocated a tariff for revenue only were disgruntled, for the tariff plank mildly asserted that "tariff duties should be levied for the purpose of revenue, but until the money question is settled we are opposed to any change in the tariff laws." The Wilson-Gorman law was then in effect. The vice-presidential nomination fell to Arthur J. Sewall of Maine.

The Populist party, which had been making such tremendous gains and bade fair to become one of the major political parties of the country, committed suicide in 1896. It endorsed the nomination of Bryan for president and thereby

merged itself with the Democratic party. Altho it named a Populist, Thomas E. Watson of Georgia, for vice-president, the vice-presidential nomination cut no figure. The Populist convention met at St. Louis and after a hard fought battle and a great deal of manipulation Bryan was nominated for president. At that time the Populist party was in control in many States and would no doubt have gained further ascendancy if it had not cast its fortunes with the Democracy. The merging process was put through by the Populists of the North who desired fusion with the Democrats in the hope of ousting the Republicans from power in the Northern States. The intense desire for office among the Populist leaders of the North had much to do in securing fusion with the Democrats. The Southern Populists, to a large extent, called themselves "Middle-of-the-Roaders," and their battle-cry was, "Keep in the middle of the road." They did not want a merger with the Democratic party because their strength had been drawn from that party and they seemed to be in a fair way of overwhelming the Democrats in many of the Southern States. The amalgamation of the Populist party with the Democrats under Bryan probably saved the Democrats from being relegated to a minor political organization. Of course the advocates of fusion were able to make a strong argument. They pointed out that an independent Populist nomination made Republican success positive while the only chance for free silver and other radical issues was in the election of Bryan; and so the Populists, in the most important national convention, sacrificed

their party on the altar of hope, that hope being the possible election of Bryan.

Up to the time of the party declarations in 1896 there had been a division in both the political parties on the question of silver. McKinley as a member of Congress at one time voted for free coinage of silver; indeed, many of the Republicans from all over the West, not alone in the silver States, were ardent advocates of the free coinage of silver. Years before, a few Republicans and Democrats were tempted away from their parties and became Greenbackers, this third party organization advocating a large issue of greenbacks as the sole currency of the country. Silver as money had more attractions than greenbacks because it was a metal and one of the moneys of the Constitution.

There were many members of the Republican convention at St. Louis who did not want a positive gold standard declaration; but the large majority of Republicans, when that declaration was once made, rallied to the support of the party, as most partizans do in every campaign. However, there were enough advocates of and believers in the free coinage of silver to make it a dangerous issue. Had it not been for the stupendous efforts of Mark Hanna, Bryan would have been elected. The party which was hopelessly defeated and divided in 1894 gathered under its banner in 1896 the discontented elements of the country and, after one of the hottest campaigns that had been known since 1860, cast 6,509,052 votes for Bryan. But the Republicans had been so active and so alert and had spent such vast sums of money to get out the voters

that they rolled up a vote for McKinley of 7,111,607. General Palmer of Illinois, who had been nominated by a so-called Gold Democratic Convention, received 222,583 votes—which did not in the least affect the result. In the electoral college McKinley had 271 votes and Bryan 176. In addition to the silver States Bryan carried Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming. But so strong was the sentiment in favor of the gold standard that McKinley broke into the solid South, securing 12 of Kentucky's 13 electoral votes and carrying Maryland and West Virginia.

XXI

“IMPERIALISM,” SILVER, THE TARIFF—MCKINLEY

BETWEEN the presidential elections of 1896 and 1900 came the Spanish War. As usual the party in power profited politically by the war. The Republicans were able to carry the congressional election of 1898 on account of the successful conduct of the war. In 1900 they were still enjoying a war prestige because of the attitude of the Democrats in opposing the policies of the Republicans after the war, particularly in acquiring and maintaining control of the Philippine Islands.

In 1900 the Republicans met in Philadelphia and unanimously re-nominated McKinley. Vice-president Hobart had died during his term and there was a very interesting preliminary contest for the vice-presidency, but finally Theodore Roosevelt of New York was named for second place. Roosevelt had long before gained a national prominence which was enhanced by his Spanish War services. He was governor of New York and preferred another term as Governor rather than the vice-presidency, but yielded to the strong demand for his nomination and reluctantly accepted.

The Democrats met at Kansas City. It was a foregone conclusion that Bryan would be re-nominated. Even the most bitter opponents of free silver in the Democratic party did not oppose him. The one great effort they put forth

was to prevent any mention of free silver in the platform other than a reaffirmation in general terms of the Chicago platform of 1896. The Democrats had determined to make their campaign in 1900 on the anti-expansion and anti-imperialism issue. Already there had been fierce denunciation of imperialism, as the acquisition of the Philippines was termed; and, as many thinking men in the United States were against holding the Islands, it was believed and declared in the platform to be "the paramount issue of the campaign." Bryan would not allow the silver issue to be passed over without a positive declaration. He even went so far as to say to the leaders that unless there was a positive affirmative declaration in favor of free coinage at the ratio of 16-to-1 he would decline the nomination. He had his way and his silver plank was put in the platform after a fierce struggle and by the deciding vote of the delegate from Hawaii. For vice-president the Democrats nominated Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois, who had been elected with Cleveland in 1892.

The tariff was an issue to some extent. The Republicans had passed the Dingley tariff act in 1897. It greatly increased duties on foreign imports over the Wilson-Gorman law, almost equalling the rates of the McKinley law. In their platform the Republicans said: "We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor," and also declared for protection for the home market. The Democratic platform condemned the Dingley tariff as a trust-breeding measure, and favored putting the products of trusts on the free list.

But neither the tariff nor silver was an important factor in the campaign. It is true that the reiteration in favor of free coinage prevented many Democrats who had left the party in 1896 from returning to the old organization. And as to the tariff there was a general feeling that constant changes from high to low duties and back again was not good business policy. The Republicans were in the ascendancy; their administration had fought a successful war and the people were generally satisfied with the after-results of the war. The Philippine insurrection against American control was a Republican asset. Acquisition of territory has never been unpopular in this country, for land hunger has ever been a characteristic of the human race.

The result was a more pronounced victory than even that of 1896. McKinley gained and Bryan lost, both in the popular vote and electoral college. McKinley's plurality was 849,790; he had 292 electors to 155 for Bryan. The Republicans regained Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, as well as one vote each in California, North Dakota, and Oregon, cast for Bryan in 1896. Kentucky returned to the Democratic party.

The Populist party had practically disappeared. It held a convention of remnants, one faction again endorsed Bryan, while the Middle-of-the-Road faction named a candidate of their own. But they had lost their opportunity when they amalgamated with the Democrats in 1896. Most of the Populists returned to the parties they had left when the Populist party was making itself a power politically.

XXII

PERSONAL POPULARITY—ROOSEVELT

WHEN the Republicans met in national convention in Chicago in 1904 Theodore Roosevelt had been president nearly three years, McKinley having died in 1901 by an assassin's bullet. Roosevelt was the unanimous choice of the delegates for a second term. Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana was nominated for vice-president.

The Democrats that year met at St. Louis and nominated Alton B. Parker of New York and Henry G. Davis of West Virginia. Parker had been elected chief justice of the court of appeals in New York by a large majority, which gave the Democrats hope that he might carry that pivotal State. He was put forward as a "safe and sane" candidate, which greatly angered Bryan. The Democratic convention was not harmonious. Bryan was there, not as a candidate, but as a delegate and a disturbing influence. He took a leading and even vicious part in a fight against seating certain Illinois delegates. Then he went into the committee on resolutions and, after a fierce all-night contest, eliminated a gold declaration which had been adopted by the subcommittee. It was this action that brought forth a telegram from Parker, noting the absence in the platform of a declaration for the gold standard, and saying that he could not accept the nomination on account of the omis-

sion. Parker had been nominated on the first ballot under the two-thirds rule, consequently there was consternation for a time over his telegram, but an adjustment was finally reached which allowed the nomination to stand. But the hostility of Bryan from the beginning to the end marked Parker for defeat before the campaign really began, altho no man in the Democratic party could have defeated Roosevelt in 1904.

The tariff continued to be a sharp dividing line between the parties. The Republicans declared: "Protection which guards and develops our institutions is a cardinal policy of the Republican party." The Democrats were also emphatic. "We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few," they asserted, and favored a tariff limited to the needs of the government.

But neither the tariff, the money question, expansion, imperialism, nor any other issue influenced the voters and decided the election. Roosevelt was the central figure and almost the sole issue in the campaign. He was personally more popular than any other man in the country at any time in its history. And so it was one of the most sweeping presidential victories of recent times. Roosevelt carried every Northern State, regaining the silver States that had voted for Bryan; also he made the second important break in the Solid South, carrying Missouri—which was the real surprise of the election. He had a plurality of 2,545,515 in the popular vote, the largest ever given a presidential candidate. He had 336 electoral votes to 140 for Parker. While Repub-

lican policies were no doubt preferred over Democratic policies at that time, it must be acknowledged that the election of 1904 was more in the nature of a personal triumph for Roosevelt than of a great party victory.

XXIII

TARIFF AND PERSONAL INFLUENCE—TAFT

EVEN with the continued successes the Republicans had gained, winning three consecutive presidential elections and every mid-term congressional election, there grew up a feeling of uneasiness in the party about the tariff. It first developed in 1906 when William H. Taft, then Secretary of War, delivered a speech at Bath, Maine, in which he advocated a revision of the tariff. As he was so close to President Roosevelt, his speech sent a chill through the protected business interests of the country which was reflected in the panic of 1907. President Roosevelt was so much interested in the tariff that he once wrote a paragraph in his annual message saying that he would later send in another message dealing with tariff revision. On the advice of men whom he consulted about the message this paragraph was eliminated. He never took it up again, but his choice for president, Secretary Taft, was known to be for tariff revision, and the promise of such revision found a place in the Republican platform of 1908.

On account of the far-reaching political effect of the tariff revision of 1909, the manner in which it was brought about is an interesting bit of the political history of the country. It happened previous to the campaign of 1908. The newspaper publishers of the country, or a large and influential number of them, demanded that

newsprint paper and wood pulp used in the manufacture of paper should be admitted free of duty. Large delegations of prominent publishers visited Washington and took the matter up with the president and with the Republican congressional leaders. The publishers were informed by the leaders that Congress could not single out one industry in order to make a special tariff bill for it and to remove or reduce the duties affecting it. Then, said the publishers, we will have a general tariff revision, and to a large extent they created the sentiment which finally induced the Republicans to make tariff revision a part of their platform.

The Republicans met in Chicago in 1908, with nearly everything settled in advance. The old-timers, leaders for many years, preferred as a candidate almost any one of a half dozen men whose names were presented to the convention, but Roosevelt had decided on William H. Taft of Ohio, and Taft was nominated on the first ballot. James S. Sherman of New York was chosen for vice-president. While the convention declared unequivocally for immediate revision of the tariff, it was asserted that the true principle of protection was best maintained by imposition of duties to equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, plus a reasonable profit to American industries.

The Democrats met in national convention at Denver to nominate William J. Bryan for a third time. While there were other candidates presented, the nomination of Bryan was made on the first ballot by an overwhelming vote. John W. Kern of Indiana was named for vice-presi-

dent. The tariff plank in the platform welcomed the belated promise of the Republicans for tariff revision, and favored the immediate revision of the tariff by a reduction of duties. A repeal of all duties on paper and pulp was demanded.

A rather listless and uninteresting campaign followed, as the result was never in doubt. Taft was elected by a wide margin. He had a popular plurality of 1,269,804, with 321 electoral votes against 162 for Bryan. Taft carried Missouri, but lost Colorado, Nebraska and Nevada.

When Taft became president he called an extra session of Congress, and after much tribulation a tariff revision bill was passed. Following the platform and on account of the protest of the protected industries against reduction, the Republicans found it almost impossible to reduce the tariff duties to any extent and in some cases there was an increase. The result was disappointing to those who hoped for reductions which would affect prices of commodities, and the revision was severely criticized, notably in the periodical press and by newspapers that were dissatisfied with the comparatively small reductions on pulp and paper. It was noteworthy that a number of Republicans in both the House and the Senate voted against the bill on the final passage because the reductions were not adequate, according to their ideas of a real tariff revision. They formed the nucleus of what afterward became the Progressive party.

The mid-term election in 1910 was very important politically. The Democrats made the campaign largely on the high cost of living, which they charged to the high tariff. The tariff

became the issue of the campaign. The tariff act of 1909 had been so roundly condemned by many Republicans, both in and out of Congress, that it became an effective campaign issue for the Democrats among the people. The Democrats won a decisive victory, securing a majority of 65 in the House and gaining several seats in the Senate. From 1890 onward it has been an unbroken precedent that the party winning a congressional election always wins the following presidential election. There has been no deviation from this political result in thirty years. Therefore the Democrats looked forward with confidence to 1912 as the time when they would regain control of the government.

XXIV

REPUBLICAN DISHARMONY—WILSON

THE presidential election of 1912 was an extraordinary affair. Early in the campaign it became apparent that the Republican party was bent upon a course which promised an easy victory for the Democrats. In less than four years Taft had alienated many prominent and influential men of his party. On account of disagreements with the administration and of dictatorial and arbitrary methods of the leaders in Congress, the progressives, who had separated from the regulars when the tariff bill was passed, gained many recruits.

One measure which proved unfortunate for the Republicans was the Canadian reciprocity treaty reducing duties on imports from Canada. It widened the breach in the Republican party. Many Republicans who were not classed as Progressives opposed this measure. The Canadian reciprocity treaty was presented to the Republican congress after the November elections. It passed the House by the aid of Democratic votes, the Republicans being nearly equally divided. It failed in the Senate because it never came to a vote, as the Congress expired by limitation. President Taft immediately called an extra session of Congress and the Canadian reciprocity bill was soon passed by the House and also passed the Senate, the Republicans being divided and the Democrats nearly all in its favor.

The Democrats passed a number of tariff bills reducing duties schedule by schedule. These bills received votes of many progressive Republicans in the House and were passed in the Senate by the aid of progressive Republicans voting with the Democrats. These bills were all vetoed by President Taft. A number of incidents occurred which drew away from Taft many of the friends of Roosevelt.

Finally the campaign of 1912 opened with Taft a candidate for re-nomination and ere long Roosevelt was also a candidate. The convention met at Chicago with the two candidates about equal in strength, but with many contests for seats by rival delegations. These contests were determined by the national committee. This committee was for Taft by more than two-thirds majority and when it had completed its labors the Taft forces had control of the convention. There was a bolt of the Roosevelt men before Taft was nominated and the day the nomination was made the Progressive party was organized. Some time after, a convention of Progressives was held and Roosevelt was nominated for president and Hiram W. Johnson of California for vice-president. James S. Sherman had been re-nominated for vice-president by the republicans.

The Democrats held their convention in Baltimore soon after the Republican convention adjourned. There were many candidates. The success of the party in 1910, the division among the Republicans, and the general trend of politics convinced the Democrats that whoever was nominated would be elected. The leading candidates were Champ Clark of Missouri, Speaker of the

House; Woodrow Wilson, governor of New Jersey; Oscar W. Underwood of Alabama, the leader of the House; Judson Harmon, governor of Ohio, Governor Thomas R. Marshall of Indiana, Governor Eugene Foss of Massachusetts, Governor Simeon Baldwin of Connecticut, and Governor John Burke of North Dakota, were favorite sons.

Bryan, tho not a candidate, was the principal figure and dominated the convention. He was defeated for temporary chairman by Parker, the candidate for president in 1904, but defeat was only temporary. Afterwards Bryan was able by his eloquence and sheer force of mind to shape the convention to his will. Clark had a majority of the delegates on nine ballots and but for the two-thirds rule would have been nominated. Even with that rule he could have been successful if Bryan had not openly charged in the convention that Clark was allied with the New York millionaires, and in a most dramatic manner broke his instructions, which were to vote for Clark, and went to Wilson. Then after many ballots Wilson was nominated.

The platforms of the three parties in the field were of no importance and no one discust their provisions. The success of the Democrats was assured when two men, each of whom had been elected president as a Republican, were contending at the head of two rival wings of that party for the grand prize. As always happens when a party splits, the rival factions are more bitter toward each other than against the opposition party. The antagonism and bitterness between Taft and Roosevelt and their followers grew day by day until near election, when Roosevelt was

shot while speaking at Milwaukee. But that did not alter the result which had long been foreshadowed.

Wilson was elected with 425 electoral votes; Roosevelt had 88, and Taft 8. Taft carried only Vermont and Utah. Roosevelt carried Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Washington. The popular vote was more equally divided. Wilson had 6,293,019, Roosevelt 4,119,507, and Taft 3,484,956; Wilson's plurality, 2,173,512.

The success of the party in the presidential election was reflected in the congressional contests. The Democrats again controlled the House and elected enough Senators to give them a majority in the Senate. For the first time in eighteen years they had control of the presidency and both branches of the national legislature. One of the early results of this control was the enactment of the Underwood tariff law, which became a political issue in the next congressional campaign.

The drift of voters is one of the peculiarities of politics and often unaccountable. Bryan, even with the increase in the number of voters in four years, had 144,792 votes less in 1900 than he received in 1896. Eight years later his vote was only 51,071 larger than he received in 1900. In 1912, four years later Wilson's vote was 116,085 less than Bryan received in 1908. The Democratic vote that year was 209,906 smaller than in 1896, sixteen years before, altho the presidential vote had increased in that time from 13,813,243 to 15,031,169. It should be remembered that the vote in one presidential election

is not repeated by exactly the same personnel four years later. There is a decrease on account of death and age and always a crop of new voters every four years. It has often been said that the new voters, young men between twenty-one and twenty-five years, decide presidential contests. That is possible so far as the actual number of voters is concerned, provided all the new voters go to one candidate; but it has been shown that in many instances personality and the circumstances of the moment are controlling factors in president making.

Two years after a crushing defeat a party is often on the way to victory. In 1914 the Republicans made one of those rapid recoveries. The Underwood tariff law was not producing enough revenue. There was a general business depression well under way. The Mexican policy of the president was unpopular. In the congressional elections the Republicans almost won a victory. But for the Great War in Europe they no doubt would have been successful. That war changed a condition of deep depression into one of prosperity. Europe began buying everything America could produce and closed mills and factories were re-opened and operated to full capacity. But there was even a more potent factor which worked for the Democrats in the West. From the beginning of the war there was a fear that the United States would be drawn into it, but President Wilson's urgent warning to practise strict neutrality and his method of dealing with the violation of American rights served to allay apprehension to some extent. He had avoided declaring war with Mexico. The Democrats

placed on the covers of their campaign text-book this slogan: "War in the East; Peace in the West; Thank God for Woodrow Wilson." That had a great deal of effect and no doubt saved the congressional elections for the Democratic party. But the election was close and the Democrats had only a small majority in the House.

At the mid-term election in 1914 the Progressives in several States and in quite a number of congressional districts continued their organization and named candidates. In at least twenty-five congressional districts the Progressives received votes which, if cast for the Republican candidates, would have elected them and given the Republicans a majority in the House. Several Republican senatorial candidates were defeated by reason of Progressives in the field, a fact which divided the Republican vote.

XXV

ANTI-WAR SENTIMENT AND TACTICAL MISTAKES—
WILSON

NO presidential election ever held in this country resembled in a remote degree that of 1916. Never before did a political party have victory so firmly within its grasp and then see that victory snatched away by a series of incidents, several of which might have been avoided.

The Republicans met at Chicago and nominated Charles E. Hughes of New York for president and Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana for vice-president. Hughes was on the Supreme bench in 1912 and therefore took no part in the Republican factional fight of that year. He was nominated in 1916 because he was the one man of prominence whom Roosevelt would support—and the Republicans thought success depended on Roosevelt's support; or, at least, they feared the consequences if Roosevelt should head the Progressive ticket. The Progressives held their convention simultaneously with the Republicans in the same city and demanded that Roosevelt be nominated by the Republicans in order to reconcile past differences. They would not agree upon any other man. When Hughes accepted the nomination in a telegram voicing strong American sentiments as to the war then raging in Europe, Roosevelt promptly gave him his support and declined the Progressive nomination which had been made soon after the nomination of Hughes by the Republicans.

The Democrats at St. Louis re-nominated Wilson and Marshall. The convention was striking in only one particular. It fairly seethed with peace talk. Both the temporary and the permanent chairmen talked peace and praised Wilson for keeping the country out of war. One of the speeches reviewed all the past differences with foreign governments and showed how most of them had been peaceably settled. At that time the relations with Germany were very much strained because the German submarines had sunk American ships and destroyed American property and ruthlessly sent to graves under the sea many American citizens, men, women and children. In spite of all these outrages, peace had been maintained. Bryan made a speech warmly endorsing Wilson and praising him for maintaining peace. Bryan had resigned as Secretary of State at the time of the *Lusitania* sinking because he would not sign the second note to Germany, as in his opinion, it was too warlike, and his endorsement of Wilson in the convention was very welcome to the Democrats.

The platforms of the two parties were, as usual, difficult to make, the subject of long drawn out sessions and even sharp contests, and were of no importance or influence in the election.

Roosevelt, who was earnestly supporting Hughes, made a number of anti-German speeches which gave the Democrats an opportunity to put forth the claim or allegation that in case Hughes was elected he would be a war president and embroil this country in the Great War. Wilson gave color to this idea in speeches in which he

plainly indicated that the Republicans were a war party. Primarily the election was won by the slogan, "He kept us out of war." The country did not want war and voted for a peace president. While there was a bitter feeling against Germany and many of our people were anxious to have the United States go to the aid of the Allies, the majority were against war and so voted.

But even the desire for peace would not have won the election had it not been for other influences and incidents. One important factor was the winning of the Mormons of the West back to the Democratic party, which they had left in 1900. The Mormon vote in the States where they are in control, hold the balance of power or have a very large vote, had generally been cast for the Republicans since 1900. In 1916 all of these States went Democratic, and they had enough electoral votes to change the result.

An unfortunate and decisive factor in the campaign was the trip of Hughes through the West. He did not make a good impression and failed to "get in political touch" with those who were influential in elections. At Los Angeles, California, Hughes and Hiram W. Johnson were in the same hotel, but they did not meet. Johnson had been the candidate for vice-president on the Roosevelt ticket four years previous. He was governor of California and the Republican nominee for United States senator. And yet Hughes and Johnson did not meet! Johnson was elected senator by 297,215 majority and Hughes lost California by 3,773 plurality. California would have elected Hughes.

The Republicans sent a "Woman's Special" through the West. This was a special campaign train carrying a number of women orators from the East. At that time there were no women suffrage States in the East and the women of the West resented the invasion. They had won suffrage for themselves and did not feel that it was entirely seemly or proper for women of the East, who were still without the ballot, to come in such an ostentatious manner and tell those who already possess the ballot how to use it. Moreover, the women of the West were deeply impressed with the popular campaign cry, "He kept us out of war," and they voted for Wilson.

On the night of the election it was generally conceded at first that Hughes was elected. It soon became apparent that all of the heretofore doubtful States, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Indiana, had gone for Hughes and also such States as Illinois and Wisconsin, so it seemed absolutely certain that he was elected. It was not until toward early in the morning of the day following the election that disquieting reports coming from the far West changed the Republican joy into doubt and after several days into gloom and defeat.

There were strange features in that election. One of them was that Ohio voted for Wilson with a plurality of 89,408. Ohio had not given its electoral vote to a Democrat, save in the abnormal campaign of 1912, since the organization of the Republican party. The border States of Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia went Republican, but Ohio joined the "solid South" and the West, electing a Demo-

ELECTION OF 1916

	TOTAL VOTE		POPULAR VOTE		Hanly Pro.	Benson Socialist
	Hughes Rep.	Wilson Dem.	Hughes Rep.	Wilson Dem.		
Alabama	12	22,869	99,409	1,034	1,925	
Arizona	3	29,524	33,170	1,153	3,174	
Arkansas	9	47,148	112,148	2,015	6,999	
California	13	462,394	466,200	27,698	43,259	
Colorado	6	102,308	178,816	2,793	10,049	
Connecticut	7	106,514	99,786	1,789	5,179	
Delaware	1	26,611	21,753	566	480	
Florida	6	14,611	55,984	4,855	5,353	
Georgia	14	11,225	125,845		967	
Idaho	4	55,368	70,054	1,127	8,966	
Illinois	29	1,152,549	950,229	26,047	61,394	
Iowa	15	341,095	334,063	16,368	21,855	
Kansas	13	280,449	221,699	3,371	10,976	
Kentucky	10	277,658	314,588	12,882	24,685	
Louisiana	13	241,854	269,990	3,036	4,734	
Louisiana	10	6,466	79,875		292	
Maine	6	69,596	64,127	597	2,177	
Maryland	8	117,347	138,359	2,903	2,674	
Massachusetts	18	268,784	247,885	2,993	11,058	
Michigan	17	339,097	285,151	8,139	16,129	
Minnesota	12	179,544	179,152	7,793	20,117	
Mississippi	10	4,273	80,422		1,484	
Missouri	18	369,339	398,025	3,884	14,612	
Montana	4	66,750	101,063		9,561	
Nebraska	8	117,257	158,827	2,952	7,141	
Nevada	3	12,127	17,776	348	3,065	
New Hampshire	4	43,723	43,779	363	1,318	
New Jersey	14	269,352	211,645	3,187	10,462	
New Mexico	3	31,163	33,693	112	1,929	
New York	45	869,115	759,426	19,031	45,944	
North Carolina	12	129,988	168,383	51	490	
North Dakota	5	53,471	55,206	967	3,714	
Ohio	24	514,753	604,161	8,980	38,092	
Oklahoma	10	97,233	148,113	1,646	45,199	
Oregon	5	126,813	120,087	4,729	9,711	
Pennsylvania	28	703,734	521,784	28,525	42,637	
Rhode Island	3	44,875	40,394	470	1,914	
South Carolina	9	1,550	61,846		135	
South Dakota	5	64,217	59,191	1,774	3,760	
Tennessee	12	116,223	153,282	147	2,542	
Texas	29	64,999	286,514	1,955	18,963	
Utah	4	51,137	84,025	149	4,460	
Vermont	4	40,250	22,708	709	798	
Virginia	12	49,356	102,824	783	1,660	
Washington	7	167,244	183,388	6,868	22,860	
West Virginia	7	143,124	140,463	175	6,140	
Wisconsin	13	221,323	193,942	7,166	27,846	
Wyoming	3	21,698	28,316	373	1,455	
	254	277	8,538,921	9,129,606	221,593	590,829
Plurality	23		Plurality	591,385		

crat president. It was one of the surprises of the campaign.

Before the election no one would have believed that a candidate carrying New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and five of the New England States could possibly lose, but such was the fact. New York, which had been a pivotal State and a president maker for the greater part of one hundred years, for the first time since 1868 saw a president elected without her electoral vote.

In the final count Wilson had 277 and Hughes 254. Had the result in California been reversed, the vote would have been Hughes 266 and Wilson 265. But there would have been contests over Minnesota and West Virginia. Minnesota was carried by Hughes by only 392 plurality, and there were allegations of irregular voting. The anti-war feeling in that State accounted for the large vote for Wilson. A Republican United States senator was elected at the same time with a plurality of 67,618. In West Virginia it was alleged that there had been extensive colonization of negroes from the border States which gave the Republican electors their majority. When it was finally determined that the California vote was for Wilson, the plans for contesting the elections in the other States were discontinued.

Analyzing the vote of States along the northern border, it is found that the suffering of Canada by the war and the part she took in it made a profound impression on the people who were her neighbors. New Hampshire, always Repub-

lican, voted for Wilson, by a plurality of 56. North Dakota also voted for Wilson, and it was observed that in the counties of various States on the Canadian border the Wilson vote generally exceeded the Democratic vote for the remainder of the ticket.

The whole West, however, was affected by the war and by the belief that Wilson was war-proof. Two States only west of the Missouri river line, South Dakota and Oregon, were carried by Hughes. Seven of the nine States in which women voted for president were carried by Wilson, showing that the women voters were impressed by the war and were anxious that their husbands, sons, and relatives should be kept out of it. The result showed clearly that it was the anti-war sentiment in the country that re-elected Wilson in 1916.

Ever since 1876 the party electing the president elected also the House of Representatives. Often the election was close. For example in the election in 1888 the Republicans had only three majority in the House before the new States were admitted—which gave them five additional majority. So close was the election in 1916 that neither of the major parties had a majority of the House, but the Democrats were enabled to control with the aid of the Socialist, Prohibition, and independent members.

As it has happened that congressional elections since 1890 have been a true index of the succeeding presidential elections, both political parties entered the mid-term campaign of 1918 with all their energies and resources.

Altho the country had been plunged into war

soon after the election in 1916, both parties loyally supported the government. The Republicans, more especially in the East, had been a war party long before actual hostilities began, and they were as loyal to the administration's war program as the Democrats, so the war was scarcely an issue, tho attempts were made to make support of administration candidates a test of war loyalty.

One of the interesting features of the campaign was the personal activity of President Wilson. He decided contests in his own party in several States between rival candidates for the Senate and the House and took an active part in the general campaign. A short time before the election he issued an appeal to the country to elect a Democratic congress, basing it upon the ground that he needed the loyalty of his own party to support him in the successful prosecution of the war. The effect of this remarkable document was in the nature of a boomerang, as it stimulated the Republicans to renewed interest and endeavor. More than ever before they asserted their loyalty to the government, their desire for the most earnest and successful prosecution of the war, pointing out that as a party they had supported and voted for every war measure asked by the administration.

The result was a surprise—stunning to the Democrats and gratifying to the Republicans. Not only did the Republicans carry the House of Representatives by a majority of forty-five, but they made such unexpected gains in the Senate as to give them a majority of two in that branch of Congress.

XXVI

THE NEGRO AS A POLITICAL FACTOR

THE negro has been intertwined in the politics of the nation from the beginning of the government. He was considered in the framing of the Constitution; he was the occasion of one of the compromises of that immortal document. Two-fifths of the slave population was counted in the total allowance in making the apportionment for members of the House, so that to this extent the slaves contributed to the voting strength of the South in Congress and in the electoral college. As a slave he was the cause of more political bickering than any other subject ever before the American people, and finally caused the Civil War—a contest of four years of bloody strife between the sections, and, so far as this country is concerned, greater and of more importance than any other war in which it had participated.

Since the Civil War the negro has been a most important factor in the politics of the country. By constitutional amendments former slaves were granted the ballot and guaranteed civil rights. For a time, by reason of the support of the federal army and in conjunction with white carpet-baggers, the negroes were able to control a number of Southern States. By this control a president of the United States was once elected.

When white men regained control of the former slave States, they made them solidly Democratic, creating the “solid South.” All of the

prejudice aroused by Union victory in the Civil War and by the reconstruction period, all the horrors and bitter feelings created by the days of negro domination in the South, are associated in the minds of the Southern people with Republican rule. The negroes are Republican. The Republican party in the South is to a great extent composed of or dominated by negroes. Consequently the "nigger" issue is the best asset of the Democrats of the South. They are assured, without an effort, of electing 140 Representatives and 173 presidential electors in every campaign. The possible danger of negro domination makes those States Democratic beyond doubt. Occasionally there have been temporary breaks, as in the case of Kentucky in 1896 and Missouri in 1904 and 1908; but such changes are sporadic and occur only as a result of abnormal conditions. While the negro does not vote or exercise any political control in most of the Southern States, yet he is counted in the population so that the South has representation based upon the total of whites and blacks, altho the whites do the voting and maintain control. This, it can at once be seen, is a great political advantage and in several elections has been sufficient to give the Democrats the presidency and control of Congress.

The negro in Republican politics has been both a liability and an asset. He has often been the decisive factor in Republican nominating conventions. Southern States, which could not give a single electoral vote to the Republicans, have often been able to determine who should be the candidate. In one or two instances the

barter for negro delegates has been a disgrace, but seemed unavoidable when men with money sought their votes. Nominations secured by the aid of negro delegates, at least on two occasions, have resulted in the defeat of the candidates. The negro becomes an asset to the Republicans in several States. While not always the case, it sometimes happens in close elections that the negro vote is an important factor in such States as Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Delaware. It has been asserted that on several occasions, even in New York as well as the States named, elections have been saved for the Republicans by the negro vote. One of the reasons why the Republicans for years refused to curtail the representation of Southern States in national conventions was because of the adverse effect it might have upon the negroes in States in the North that were necessary for Republican success. On every occasion when attempts were made to reduce the Southern representation they were met by threats of loss of negro votes in the Northern States. It was the demand of the Progressive Republicans, when they were about to return to their old allegiance, that finally brought about a change and caused the representation in national conventions to be based upon the votes cast for the Republican ticket in a previous election.

The South, by methods of its own, somewhat devious and irregular, and later by constitutional enactments, eliminated the negro as a voting factor. But it is the efforts of Republicans to secure for the negro his voting rights that have enabled the Democrats to make the negro

such a pronounced political factor. And yet no real effort on the part of Republicans in that direction has been made since 1891, when the last election bill for negroes in the South was attempted. Between the terms of Cleveland and Wilson there was a period of fourteen years when the Republicans had absolute control of the presidency and of both houses of Congress, and yet no legislation was passed or even attempted to put into full force and effect the fifteenth amendment which gave the negro the franchise. It is not probable that any such attempt ever will be made. And whether the negro shall continue, as in the past, to be a controlling factor in the politics of one great section of the country depends upon the efforts that have been made, heretofore without success, to organize and maintain a white man's Republican party in the Southern States.

XXVII

PROHIBITION, SUFFRAGE, SOCIALISM

PROHIBITION and woman suffrage are two important questions that have been before the country for half a century, one of which has been settled by constitutional amendment and the other is destined soon to achieve the same success. Neither of them, as important and far-reaching in effect as they will be, have been political issues to such an extent as to affect political results. It has often been said that the prohibitionists drew enough votes from Blaine in 1884 to give Cleveland the electors in New York. But that is guess work. Who can tell how those men who voted for St. John would have voted if there had been no prohibition ticket in the field? Possibly they would not have voted at all and the result would have been the same. It was asserted in the early days of the prohibition movement that the prohibitionists were former Republicans; but in the later days, when prohibition gained strength and marched to victory, both Democrats and Republicans were actually crowding each other in an effort to vote for the amendment. There was really no party politics in prohibition.

The same is true of woman suffrage. Republicans and Democrats are equally insistent in pushing the suffrage movement. It is true that woman suffrage has been retarded and delayed by Democrats from Southern States, but that

was due to the negro question and was not a sex suffrage question. The Southerners object to disturbing in any way the voting conditions in the South. Only on one occasion have the women voters influenced the election of a president, but they were then voting against war and for peace. They were not alone, however, in accepting the slogan, "He kept us out of war," for men voted for peace as eagerly as the women. For the present, at least, and not until there is equal franchise for women throughout the greater part of the country, can there be any determination as to the influence which they will have upon the politics of the country.

Socialism has never been an important political factor, but the growth of the Socialist vote and the tenacity with which the party with a comparatively small vote presents candidates in every election has been one of the interesting features of politics. At present Socialism is one of the real uncertainties in politics. No one knows how powerful the socialists might become if they should succeed in uniting all the discordant elements of the country in one party. It has generally happened that the discontented element having its origin in agricultural communities can not find a common ground with the discontented among the working men. This is natural in view of the fact that the agriculturists want high prices for their products and low wages for the farm, while the working men want low prices on living commodities and high wages. Every attempt to form a political organization or an organization to work together in politics splits on this difference in conditions. They

have been unable to find a common ground save that of discontent.

As far back as in 1888 there were two labor tickets in the field. One called itself Union Labor and polled 148,105 votes; the other called itself United Labor and polled 2,808 votes. In 1892 there was a Socialist-Labor ticket in the field polling 21,164 votes. In 1896 the same organization had 36,274 votes. This organization has continued to have candidates receiving a few thousand votes in each election.

In 1900 Eugene V. Debs of Indiana first appeared as a presidential candidate on a ticket called Socialist-Democratic, and he received 87,814 votes. Running as a Socialist in 1904 he received 402,283 votes; again in 1908, 420,793 votes. In 1912, with Taft as the Republican nominee, Roosevelt the Progressive candidate, and Wilson on the Democratic ticket, Debs was for a third time the Socialist candidate and received the largest vote ever cast by the Socialists up to that time, 901,873. In 1916 Allan J. Benson of New York was the Socialist candidate for president, and the vote fell to 590,579, a loss of 311,294.

Probably the bulk of the votes which the Socialists lost went to Wilson, for the Socialists were opposed to war and the peace promises of the president no doubt induced them to support him. In the close and deciding State of California the Socialist vote dropt from 79,201 in 1912 to 43,259 in 1916. In North Dakota the loss was 6,966, in New Hampshire 662, in Washington 17,334. In each of these States the loss of the

Socialists was greater than the plurality given Wilson.

Without doubt the Great War has caused changes in the United States which will largely increase the Socialist vote, particularly if the various organizations that have come to the surface in the past few years should unite upon Socialist candidates. The figures as to the Socialist vote in 1918 are not available, but it is known that there was a large increase over 1916. In New York the Socialist vote in 1912 was 63,381; in 1916 it was 45,944; and in 1918 on the governorship it jumped to 123,071.

It is reasonable to assume that in the future as in the past politics will be governed by conditions and events. It has been seen that as regards presidents every war produces a number. Two men of the war of the Revolution, two of the war of 1812, two of the Mexican War, five of the Civil War and one of the Spanish War became presidents of the United States. That is, 12 of the 27 men who have been presidents were gunpowder men; their war records were either a determining factor or an asset in their selection for the great office. The Great War may make presidents in the future. It is certain that a political campaign will be made on issues growing out of the war, and that for many years hence the war of 1917-1918 will be felt in the politics of the country and have a part in making presidents of the United States.

m. 2. 7

W. 4

